

## Portland State University PDXScholar

---

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

Oregon Sustainable Community Digital Library

---

4-14-2005

### Meeting Notes 2005-04-14

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: [http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_jpact](http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, "Meeting Notes 2005-04-14 " (2005). *Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation*. Paper 402.

[http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl\\_jpact/402](http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/oscdl_jpact/402)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

**A G E N D A**

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE PORTLAND, OREGON 97232-2736



**METRO**

TEL 503-797-1916 FAX 503-797-1930

JPACT RECORD-KEEPER  
METRO  
600 NE GRAND AVE  
PORTLAND OR 97232

**MEETING: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION**

**DATE: Thursday, April 14, 2005**

**TIME: 7:15 A.M.**

**PLACE: Council Chambers, Metro Regional Center**

<b>7:15</b>	<b>CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM</b>	<b>Rex Burkholder, Chair</b>
<b>7:15</b>	<b>INTRODUCTIONS</b>	<b>Rex Burkholder, Chair</b>
<b>7:20</b>	<b>CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS</b>	
<b>7:25</b>	<b>LEGISLATIVE UPDATE</b>	<b>Randy Tucker (Metro)</b>
<b>7:40</b>	<b>COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE CHAIR</b>	<b>Rex Burkholder, Chair</b>
	* Congressional Visit Feedback	<b>Randy Tucker (Metro)</b> <b>Olivia Clark (TriMet)</b>
	* TEA-LU Update	<b>Andy Cotugno (Metro)</b>
	Bi-State Committee Report	<b>Rex Burkholder, Chair</b>
<b>8:10</b>	<b>DISCUSSION ITEMS</b>	
	* Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) Update - <u>INFORMATIONAL</u>	<b>Tom Kloster (Metro)</b>
	* ODOT Local Official Survey - <u>INFORMATIONAL</u>	<b>Andy Cotugno (Metro)</b>
<b>8:30</b>	<b>RESOLUTIONS/ORDINANCES</b>	
	* Resolution No. 05-3541 For the Purpose of Approving The FY2006 Unified Planning Work Program – <u>JPACT APPROVAL REQUESTED</u>	<b>Andy Cotugno (Metro)</b>
	* Resolution No. 05-3542 For the Purpose of Certifying That The The Portland Metropolitan Area Is in Compliance With Federal Transportation Planning Requirements – <u>JPACT APPROVAL REQUESTED</u>	<b>Andy Cotugno (Metro)</b>
	* Resolution No. 05-3553 For the Purpose of Amending The 2004-07 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) To Eliminate The Interstate Avenue – MLK Boulevard Advanced Transportation Management System (ATMS) Project, Create an 82 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue ATMS Project and Reallocate Funds – <u>JPACT APPROVAL REQUESTED</u>	<b>Ted Leybold (Metro)</b>
<b>9:00</b>	<b>ADJOURN</b>	<b>Rex Burkholder, Chair</b>

- 
- \* Material available electronically. Please call 503-797-1916 for a paper copy
  - \*\* Material to be emailed at a later date.
  - # Material provided at meeting.  
All material will be available at the meeting.

# JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

March 17, 2005

## MEMBERS PRESENT

## AFFILIATION

Chair Rex Burkholder	Metro Council
Vice-Chair Rod Park	Metro Council
Sam Adams	City of Portland
Rob Drake	City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County
Matthew Garrett	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT – Region I)
Fred Hansen	TriMet
Bill Kennemer	Clackamas County
Brian Newman	Metro Council
Lynn Peterson	City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas County
Roy Rogers	Washington County
Maria Rojo de Steffey	Multnomah County
Steve Stuart	Clark County
Don Wagner	Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)

## MEMBERS ABSENT

## AFFILIATION

Stephanie Hallock	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Steve Owens	City of Fairview, representing Cities of Multnomah County
Royce Pollard	City of Vancouver
Bill Wyatt	Port of Portland

## ALTERNATES PRESENT

## AFFILIATION

Susie Lahsene	Port of Portland
Dean Lookingbill	SW Washington RTC
Dick Pedersen	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Dave Shields	City of Gresham

## GUESTS PRESENT

## AFFILIATION

David Bragdon	Metro Council
Jeff King	City of Milwaukie
Laurel Wentworth	City of Portland
Kathy Busse	Washington County
John Wiebke	City of Hillsboro
Kevin Smith	City of Hillsboro
Jef Dalin	City of Cornelius
John Rist	Clackamas County
Dave Nordberg	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Chris Smith	Citizen

GUESTS PRESENTAFFILIATION

Nancy Kraushaar	City of Oregon City
Ron Papsdorf	City of Gresham
Richard Meyer	City of Cornelius
Danielle Cowan	City of Wilsonville
Shelli Romero	Multnomah County
Tom Markgraf	Columbia River Crossing
Olivia Clark	TriMet
Phil Selinger	TriMet
Karen Schilling	Multnomah County
Robin McArthur	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT - Region 1)
Dick Schouten	Washington County Commission
Ed Abrahamson	Multnomah County
Mark Garrity	Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
Karl Rohde	Citizen
Rob De Graff	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
Patrick Flanagan	THPRD
Robin Katz	Port of Portland
Edward Barnes	WSDOT Commissioner
Walter Valenta	Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal Association
Charlotte Lehan	City of Wilsonville
Alice Norris	City of Oregon City
Tom Miller	City of Portland
Terry Whisler	City of Cornelius
Catherine Ciarlo	BTA
Kay Durtschi	Multnomah County – TPAC Citizen Representative
Thayer Rorabaugh	City of Vancouver
Addison Jacobs	Port of Vancouver

METRO STAFF

Richard Brandman	Alison Kean Campbell	Andy Cotugno	John Cullerton
Kim Ellis	Jan Faraca	Karen Kane	Tom Kloster
Ted Leybold	Patty Unfred Montgomery	Amelia Porterfield	Amy Rose
Kathryn Schutte	Dave Unsworth	Kelley Webb	Michael Wetter
Phil Whitmore			

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

The Chair Rex Burkholder declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 7:25 a.m.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair Burkholder welcomed Clark County Commissioner Steve Stuart to his first meeting. The Chair announced a change in the order of the agenda, delaying Communications from the Chair and Discussion Items until after consideration of the Resolutions/Ordinances items has been completed. While he delayed his report on a recent trip to Washington, D.C., he called attention to a list of regional projects earmarked in the TEA LU, from FY 2004 through FY 2009, the Reauthorization House Bill (included as part of this meeting record).

The revised order of business for the day follows:

III. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Walter Valenta, co-chair of the Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal Area, urged maintaining funding for the Killingsworth project. The urban renewal district was formed to bring money to the most blighted area of Albina, and in the past, urban renewal funds for the area have been redirected to other projects. Even though they may have been worthy projects, it is time for some funding to flow back into the Albina area, before complicated partnerships begin to unravel. Folks sometimes feel disenfranchised because promises are made and then not kept, he said. He encouraged the committee to keep some funding flowing into the area.

The Chair commented that Mr. Valenta's comments were not confined to non-agenda items.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Bill Kennemer moved and Councilor Dave Shields seconded approval of the Feb. 10, 2005 meeting minutes as presented. The motion passed.

IV. RESOLUTIONS/ORDINANCES

**RESOLUTION NO. 05-3559 METRO-TRIMET IGA PLEDGING MTIP FUNDS FOR I-205/TRANSIT MALL LIGHT RAIL, WASHINGTON COUNTY COMMUTER RAIL AND NORTH MACADAM IMPROVEMENTS**

Introduction: Andy Cotugno presented the Resolution No. 05-3559 (included as part of this meeting record).

This is implementing the series of resolutions that have been made as a funding commitment over time out of the MTIP toward, first, Interstate MAX and, now, the I-205 Light Rail, Washington County Commuter Rail and the North Macadam Access projects. This is not new money; it is already committed. TriMet will be attempting to sell "worthy" bonds on the commercial bond market, and this agreement will help shore up the stability of the bonds. The bonds pledge the first MTIP dollars for repayment; this agreement is particularly important because the life of the MTIP cycle is shorter than the bond debt repayment period.

Fred Hansen commented that in past years, TriMet has been able to use the TriMet General Fund as the repayment guarantee, but recently the economy has depleted the TriMet General Fund so that there is not an adequate excess flow to generate the needed confidence on the bond market.

Councilor Brian Newman asked if specific projects for the South Waterfront portion of the bond proceeds had been defined for funding. Laurel Wentworth of the City of Portland's Office of Transportation, indicated that funds would be directed to the Streetcar project.

ACTION TAKEN: Mr. Fred Hansen moved and Councilor Brian Newman seconded approval of Resolution No. 05-3559. The motion passed.

**RESOLUTION NO. 05-3529 PRIORITIES 2006-09 FINAL DECISION (100% PROJECT ALLOCATION)**

Andy Cotugno presented Resolution No. 05-3529 (included as part of this meeting record).

INTRODUCTION: Chair Burkholder acknowledged the hard work of many persons to bring together a package to achieve better communities through improved transportation infrastructure.

Mr. Cotugno introduced the MTIP package recommended by TPAC. The base program was developed carefully to adhere to the direction received from JPACT in January. He suggested committee members decide whether or not to over-program funds, and if the committee decides to over-program, how much and with what conditions. The base program relies on the expectation that this reauthorization bill will increase the region's funding level from \$25 to 30 million per year, or \$10 million more in the two-year period; on the other hand, a 20 percent cut in CMAQ funds (for having cleaned up the air) could occur. Allocating the full reauthorization amount builds an extra 10 percent into this MTIP revenue estimate and insures that all funds can be fully utilized during the allocation period. This allows for some projects to slip and for others in the pipeline and ready, to move forward. Mr. Cotugno suggested approval of a balanced amount of funds going towards the projects--the target revenue estimate is \$62.2 million. He advised developing a program based on less than the \$62.2 million and a contingency list that could be adopted in six months, after the bill's adoption when allocations would be firm. He cautioned that if the target revenue estimate is high, the program might need to be scaled back.

Mr. Cotugno distributed his draft project list (included as part of this meeting record) to start the conversation. The first part of the draft was composed of the TPAC-recommended base program while the second part was intended to represent a contingency list.

DISCUSSION: Matt Garrett said he supported the direction and discipline of Mr. Cotugno's proposal. He questioned when the contingency list should be made final.

Mr. Cotugno suggested that a base list with a contingency list be adopted now. If necessary, JPACT could reconsider the contingency list later. The overall program should be adopted by August, about the time the bill should have passed and questions answered about the funding levels. The air quality conformity work for all of these projects must be completed by August. Adding more projects in six months would only slow down the process because new projects also would need to complete the air quality analysis process, he said.

Councilor Dave Shields described some of the difficulties related to establishing a contingency list and suggested establishing some ground rules.

In response to questions from Councilor Lynn Peterson regarding the fluidity of project funds within jurisdictions, Mr. Cotugno indicated that the base list is project-based and changes in project funding allocations must be approved by JPACT. (There is a mechanism established for making changes.)

Fred Hansen spoke in support of the Mr. Cotugno's balanced budget proposal and favored postponing making contingency list rules until later in the meeting.

As a point of clarification, the Chair noted that the primary item on the table for discussion was the principle of a firm package of \$62.2 million. Further, the committee needed to discuss and decide if there would be a contingency list, what projects would be listed and if they would be reconsidered in six months.

ACTION TAKEN: Councilor Newman moved for approval of a package not to exceed \$62.2 million; seconded by Mayor Rob Drake. The motion passed with one dissenting vote voiced by Commissioner Roy Rogers.

Commissioner Bill Kennemer asked Commissioner Rogers to explain his no vote. Commissioner Rogers said that the list did not reflect jurisdictional equity. Washington County represents 30 percent of the population and would get only 11 or 12 percent of the revenues. He supported over-committing to prioritize some projects for the future to favor jurisdictions that may not have been rewarded in the current process. There is a Cornelius project that is important to and supported by the western part of Washington County that should be on a contingency list. If it is not included, the result would be hard feelings in Washington County, he predicted. Commissioner Rogers said he voted no to Washington County getting less than a proportionate share of the MTIP package and not having the contingent ability to move Washington County projects forward in the future.

In response to a question, Commissioner Rogers said that his vote would be a "yes" if a commitment were made to create a contingency list, regardless of the rules or content.

Mr. Hansen suggested that probably everyone at the table would agree that the discussion was headed toward establishing a contingency list.

INTRODUCTION: Chair Burkholder noted that the committee had approved the concept of a \$62.2 million budget. The next step is to consider is a contingency list—how much it should total, when it should be established and what projects it should include.

Mayor Rob Drake said he supports the idea of establishing an intelligent secondary (contingency) list in the event more funds become available. He also favored adding the City of Cornelius project to the contingency list in the interest of helping the city develop as a "complete community."

MOTION: Commissioner Sam Adams moved and seconded by Mayor Drake, to create a contingency list not to exceed \$5 million.

DISCUSSION: Commissioner Steve Stuart asked if there was a sense of how much the contingency list projects should total. The Chair responded that there might be no funding for contingency projects.

Councilor Peterson said the list begs the question of regional equity.

Councilor Dave Shields asked what criteria is used to determine how to distribute the funds.

Chair Burkholder explained that there is a screen that attempts to measure how well the MTIP process works at spreading the dollars around, with the goal of ensuring that good projects from every area get funded. It is a bit of an art—scientific application does not apply in every case, he added.

Commissioner Adams explained that his motion for a contingency list was to create a limited bucket and that determining what was in it would be a follow-up task.

Councilor Rod Park advised thinking about regional equity in terms of a project's impact beyond jurisdictional boundaries. He cited the Sellwood Bridge, which vehicles use to travel between counties and cities, as an example of a jurisdictional (Multnomah County) project with region-wide impacts.

Commissioner Maria Rojo de Steffey said Multnomah County will be getting \$3 million in federal funds for construction for the Sellwood Bridge project but the construction money cannot be used to do the start-up work. The county needs an additional \$500,000 from MTIP to begin the work. There are not many sources for funding of big bridge projects, she noted.

Chair Burkholder suggested focusing on the three basic issues, as follows:

- 1) Are we aiming for a firm target of \$62.2 million?
- 2) Should we have a contingency list and how should it be structured?
- 3) How to develop a base package plus a secondary list; which of the many variations should be used?

In response, Councilor Newman restated the motion on the floor: there should be a contingency list, it should be prioritized and it should not exceed \$5 million. After a brief discussion, the Chair called for the vote.

ACTION TAKEN: The motion to create a contingency list not to exceed \$5 million passed.

MOTION: Mayor Drake moved, seconded by Susie Lahsene, to adopt a base package today and begin work toward the contingency list.

DISCUSSION: Commissioner Rogers urged the committee to review the equity issue. He mentioned his concern about the Powerline Trail project, which involves a complex agreement among a number of parties including the Trust for Public Lands, and the need for an immediate commitment of \$600,000.

In response to a question from Mr. Hansen, Mayor Drake said his intent was to approve a base



package today and then develop a contingent list. He did not want to exclude projects that probably should be funded in the cycle and could be on a list to select individually. He mentioned \$600,000 for the Powerline Trail project where the option is soon to expire.

Mr. Hansen observed that the budget list of \$62.2 million would have to be agreed upon within two weeks. In response to a question, Mr. Cotugno explained that to avoid future delays in project funding, the timely initiation and completion of the air quality analysis process would be undertaken for all base and contingency projects.

Susie Lahsene asked if projects within the base program could be substituted at this point in time. She noted that the committee had already moved on the I-205 Light Rail, commuter rail and South Waterfront Streetcar projects.

Chair Burkholder encouraged Mayor Drake to repeat the motion on the floor: The motion was to adopt the base package today and to begin developing a contingency list.

Mr. Hansen asked for clarification on what the base package totaled. Following a brief discussion, it was agreed to define the base package as recommended by TPAC at \$56.908 million.

Mr. Cotugno stated that parliamentary procedure allows for amendments, and discussion, to be entertained before calling for a vote on the motion.

The Chair opened the floor to amendments up to \$62.2 million and discussion.

Councilor Shields asked for clarification about the contents of the base package. The Chair said the decision about which projects to include on the base and contingency lists was at the discretion of the committee.

As a point of procedure, the Chair suggested that the committee hear amendments and then recess briefly before voting.

Commissioner Bill Kennemer said that before the committee started taking amendments, he favored having additional discussion because he did not support the base and others might feel the same way. He said he was displeased about the process that would allow a \$700,000 project for Clackamas County in the base package that was not the county's first priority. He wanted to discuss the process and the issue of regional equity.

It was suggested that Commissioner Kennemer could propose an amendment to revise the allocation and/or the project. Commissioner Kennemer's response was that he thought that the process needed to be reviewed and revised.

Councilor Rod Park commented that JPACT received policy directives from the Metro Council to support the program and the base package. Policies and priorities were laid out; there was an agreement to prioritize projects least likely to have other funding options, and this was the result. Councilor Park and the Chair agreed that the process was difficult.

Mr. Hansen suggested dividing the discussion into parts, one to consider the more straightforward amendments that would enable project substitutions; and another part to consider the fundamental issues described by Commissioner Kennemer.

AMENDMENTS (Adjustments to the Base Program):

An amendment to the base moved by Commissioner Adams and seconded by Councilor Newman, would subtract \$1.0 million from the Cully Boulevard project and add \$1.0 million to the Eastside Streetcar project; subtract \$0.1 million from the Ledbetter project and subtract \$0.21 million from the North Lombard Slough Bridge project and add \$0.31 million to the SW Capitol Highway project.

An amendment to the base moved by Councilor Peterson and seconded by Mayor Drake, would subtract \$0.74 million from the Trolley Trail project and add \$0.74 million to the 172nd Avenue project.

An amendment to the base moved by Susie Lahsene and seconded by Mayor Drake, would subtract \$0.4 million from the Killingsworth project and add \$0.4 million to the Ledbetter extension project. *(Ms. Lahsene later withdrew this amendment.)*

AMENDMENTS (Additions to the Base Program):

An amendment to the base moved by Councilor Peterson and seconded by Commissioner Kennemer, would add \$2.0 million for the 172nd Avenue project; add \$0.9 million for the South AMTRAK Station, and subtract \$0.45 million from the Ledbetter extension project.

An amendment to the base moved by Commissioner Rojo de Steffey and seconded by Mr. Garrett, would add \$0.5 million to the Sellwood Bridge project.

An amendment to the base moved by Councilor Dave Shields and seconded by Commissioner Rojo de Steffey, would add \$1.54 million to the Cleveland Avenue project.

An amendment to the base moved by Mayor Drake and seconded by Commissioner Steve Stuart, would add \$0.6 million to the Powerline Trail right-of-way project.

An amendment to the base moved by Commissioner Rogers and seconded by Mayor Drake, would add \$1.0 million to the Beaverton-Hillsdale/Scholls/Oleson PE project.

An amendment to the base moved by Mayor Drake and seconded by Mr. Garrett, would add \$0.86 million to the City of Cornelius's 10th Avenue Intersections project.

RECESS AND RECONVENE: The Chair called for a brief recess and then reconvened the meeting.

A modification to the previously stated amendment moved by Commissioner Adams would add \$0.685 million for the Marine Drive bike lanes/path project, \$0.5 million for Gateway TOD project, and \$1.45 million for the Ledbetter extension project (to a total of \$1.8 million).

A modification to the previously stated amendment moved by Mr. Hansen would add \$0.6 million for the Willamette Shoreline/Highway 43 project preliminary engineering (PE).

A modification to the previously stated amendment moved by Commissioner Rojo de Steffey would add \$0.45 million for the Wood Village Boulevard project.

DISCUSSION: The Chair indicated that he had suspended the usual Roberts rules.

Mayor Drake proposed, seconded by Commissioner Roy, to modify his original motion to stipulate that the amendments be referred to the JPACT Finance Committee meeting next week to delineate between projects for the base package and the contingency list. He said his intention was to act on the "clean" substitutions as discussed prior to the recess and let JPACT Finance Committee deal with the add-on amendments next week. Further, he said he was concerned that the amendment process was adding on more projects for funding than the revenue projections would allow and Commissioner Kennemer agreed.

Commissioner Steve Stuart asked for clarification about the substitutions.

Mayor Drake indicated amendments to be included in the base for action today and those to be considered for the contingency list at the JPACT meeting next week (included as part of the meeting record). Committee members concurred that clarification was needed on the Ledbetter project proposals and that they should be held over to the next meeting. The Chair indicated the need for refinements.

Commissioner Adams requested that staff provide an accounting of the level of funding for each project at the JPACT meeting next week.

Ms. Lahsene withdrew her amendment to base package regarding the Ledbetter project with the understanding that the City of Portland and the Port of Portland would work together to clarify the proposal.

MOTION: An amendment from the Chair was moved and seconded by Mr. Hansen, to clarify and act on Mayor Drake's motion to accept the base package as recommended by TPAC plus the "clean" amendments (the adjustments to the Base Program), and forward the remaining amendments to the JPACT meeting the next week for action. (See Attachment 1 – Proposed JPACT Amendments to 2005 Transportation Priorities.)

ACTION TAKEN: The motion passed.

NEXT MEETING: Thursday, March 24, 2005

V. ADJOURN: Hearing no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:20 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jan Faraca  
Recording Secretary

Attachment 1  
**Proposed JPACT Amendments to  
2005 Transportation Priorities**

Base Program	\$56.91
--------------	---------

JPACT Recommended changes to Base Program (revenue neutral)

Cully Boulevard	-\$1.0
Eastside Streetcar	+\$1.0
Leadbetter extension	-\$0.1
N Lombard Slough Bridge	-\$0.21
Capitol Highway Pedestrian	+\$0.31
Trolley Trail	-\$0.74
172 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue	+\$0.74

JPACT motions to consider project additions to Base Program. <sup>(1)</sup>

172 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue	\$2.0
South Metro Amtrak Station	\$0.9
Leadbetter extension	(\$0.45)
Sellwood Bridge PE	\$0.5
Cleveland Avenue	\$1.54
Powerline Trail right-of-way	\$0.6
10 <sup>th</sup> Avenue Intersections (Cornelius)	\$0.86
Beaverton-Hillsdale/Scholls/Oleson PE	\$1.0
Marine Drive bike lanes/path	\$0.69
Gateway TOD	\$0.5
Leadbetter extension <sup>(2)</sup>	\$1.45
Willamette Shoreline/Hwy 43 PE	\$0.6
Wood Village Boulevard	\$0.45
Total Potential Project Additions	\$10.64
Total Base + Potential Project Additions	\$67.55
Forecasted Revenues	\$62.23
Potential Project Cost above Forecasted Revenues	\$5.32

<sup>(1)</sup> Potential Project additions will be recommended for additions within a financially constrained Total Program of \$62.2 million (current forecast of expected revenues) and additions contingent on potential funds made available through the federal reauthorization bill beyond the forecasted \$62.2 million.

<sup>(2)</sup> This request was to fund the Leadbetter project at a total of \$1.8 million. If the earlier request to reduce funding of the Leadbetter project by \$.45 million is accepted, it would require an additional \$1.45 million to fund the Leadbetter project at \$1.8 million.

Project code	Project name	JPACT Approved Base Package (millions of \$)	Potential Adds	Balanced Package	Contingent Additions
<b>Planning</b>					
PI0005	Regional Freight Planning: region wide	\$0.300			
PI0001	MPO Required Planning: region wide	\$1.731			
PI1003	Milwaukie LRT Supplemental EIS: Portland central city to Milwaukie town center	\$2.000			
PI5053	Multi-Use Master Plans: Lake Oswego to Milwaukie, Tonquin Trail, Mt. Scott -Scouter's Loop	\$0.300			
PI0002	Next Priority Corridor Study	\$0.500			
PI1017	Willamette Shoreline - Hwy 43 transit alternatives analysis/PE: Portland South Waterfront to Lake Oswego	\$0.688	\$0.600		
<b>Bike/Trail</b>					
Bk1009	Springwater Trail-Sellwood Gap: SE 19th to SE Umallilla	\$1.629			
BK4011	Marine Dr. Bike Lanes & Trail Gaps: 6th Ave. to 185th	\$0.966	\$0.685		
Bk2055	Springwater Trailhead at Main City Park	\$0.310			
Bk2052	MAX Multi-use Path: Cleveland Station to Ruby Junction	\$0.890			
Bk5026	Trolley Trail: Arista to Glen Echo (Segments 5-6)	\$0.000			
Bk3012	Rock Creek Trail: Orchard Park to NW Wilkens	\$0.675			
Bk3072	Powerline Trail (north): Schuepback Park to Burntwood Dr. (ROW)		\$0.600		
<b>Pedestrian</b>					
Pd3163	Forest Grove Town Center Pedestrian Improvements	\$0.660			
Pd5054	Milwaukie Town Center: Main/Harrison/21st	\$0.450			
Pd1202	SW Capitol Highway (PE): Multnomah to Taylors Ferry	\$0.310			
<b>Regional Travel Options</b>					
n/a	Program management & administration	\$0.340			
n/a	Regional marketing program	\$2.960			
n/a	Regional evaluation	\$0.300			
n/a	1 TravelSmart project	\$0.500			
<b>Transit Oriented Development</b>					
TD0005	Regional TOD LRT Station Area Program	\$3.000			
TD0002	Regional TOD Urban Center Program	\$1.000			
TD0003	Site acquisition: Beaverton regional center	\$2.000			
TD0004	Gateway Transit Center Redevelopment		\$0.500		
<b>Transit</b>					
Tr1001	I-205 LRT, Commuter Rail, S Waterfront Streetcar	\$16.000			
Tr1002	I-205 Supplemental	\$2.600			
Tr8035	Frequent Bus Capital program	\$2.750			
Tr1106	Eastside Streetcar (Con)	\$1.000			
Tr5126	South Metro Amtrak Station: Phase II		\$0.900		
<b>Road Capacity</b>					
RC6014	SW Greenburg Road: Washington Square Dr. to Tiedeman	\$1.000			
RC1184	Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy/Oleson/Scholls Ferry Intersection (PE)		\$1.000		
RC7000	SE 172nd Ave: Phase I, Sunnyside to Hwy 212 (ROW + \$1.0m)	\$0.742	\$2.000		
RC2110	Wood Village Blvd. Arata to Halsey		\$0.450		
<b>Road Reconstruction</b>					
RR3166	10th Avenue at Highway 8 intersections		\$0.837		
RR2035	Cleveland St: NE Stark to SE Powell		\$1.540		
<b>Boulevard</b>					
Bd3020	Rose Biggi extension: Crescent St. to Hall (PE)	\$0.580			
Bd1051	Burnside Street: Bridge to E. 14th (PE)	\$1.650			
Bd1260	Killingsworth: N Commercial to NE MLK (PE)	\$0.400			
<b>Freight</b>					
Fr4063	N Lombard Slough over crossing	\$2.000			

JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

March 24, 2005

Continuation of March 17, 2005 Meeting

MEMBERS PRESENT

AFFILIATION

Chair Rex Burkholder	Metro Council
Vice-Chair Rod Park	Metro Council
Rob Drake	City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County
Roy Rogers	Washington County
Maria Rojo de Steffey	Multnomah County
Don Wagner	Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
Steve Stuart	Clark County
Bill Wyatt	Port of Portland
Brian Newman	Metro Council
Bill Kennemer	Clackamas County
Fred Hansen	TriMet
Lynn Peterson	City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas County
Sam Adams	City of Portland

MEMBERS ABSENT

AFFILIATION

Matt Garrett	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
Stephanie Hallock	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Steve Owen	City of Fairview, representing Cities of Multnomah County
Royce Pollard	City of Vancouver

ALTERNATES PRESENT

AFFILIATION

Susie Lahsene	Port of Portland
James Bernard	City of Milwaukie
Councilor Dave Shields	City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah County
Dick Pedersen	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Robin McArthur	Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)

GUESTS PRESENT

AFFILIATION

Patrick Flanagan	Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation District (THPRD)
Mark Garrity	Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
Ed Abrahamson	Multnomah County
Shelly Romero	Multnomah County
Karen Schilling	Multnomah County
Ron Papsdorf	City of Gresham
Walter Valenta	Interstate URA/Bridgeton
Kathy Busse	Washington County

Laurel Wentworth	City of Portland
Gregg Everhart	Portland Parks and Recreation
Tom Miller	City of Portland
Robert Liberty	Metro Council
Scott Bricker	Citizen
Dick Schouten	Washington County
Nancy Kraushaar	City of Oregon City
Alice Norris	City of Oregon City
Olivia Clark	TriMet
Phil Selinger	TriMet
John Rist	Clackamas County
Kay Deutsche	Neighbor of Multnomah County
Dave Nordberg	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Jim Bernard	City of Milwaukie
Jef Dalin	City of Cornelius
Kathie Eastman	State Representative Earl Blumenauer's Office
Robin Katz	Port of Portland
Laura Oppenheimer	The Oregonian
Jonathan Schlueter	Westside Economic Alliance
Mark Williams	Oregon Health and Science University (OHSU)

#### STAFF PRESENT

Andy Cotugno	Ted Leybold	Kathryn Schutte	Richard Brandman
John Mermin	Karen Kane	Tom Kloster	Amelia Porterfield
Amy Rose			

#### I. CALL TO ORDER, DECLARATION OF A QUORUM AND INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Rex Burkholder called the meeting to order and declared a quorum at 7:22 a.m.

#### II. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

A citizen was concerned after approving the base program last week that the committee had managed to take out the number one trail property.

#### III. RESOLUTION NO. 05-3529 PRIORITIES 2006-09 FINAL DECISION (100% PROJECT ALLOCATION)

Councilor Rod Park went over the MTIP Proposal worksheet (included as part of this meeting record).

Mr. Fred Hansen thought there were two proposals 1) get Part 1 & 2 to balance and 2) Sam Adams had proposed the idea of a \$5 million bucket to program as a contingent commitment to projects subject to receipt of sufficient funds.



Mr. Fred Hansen was concerned that if there is money, and the project isn't in this category, the committee won't be ready to do anything with it.

Mr. Andy Cotugno stated if we do what is on the MTIP Proposal sheet and end up having more money, the more money on the table adds to what is allocated next time. The federal agencies require a three-year program and any over programming we do is included in the fourth year. With this being a four-year plan, next time the committee will have the ability to program a windfall if there is one.

Mr. Fred Hansen suggested the committee could do it now and go through conformity with some money in the bucket, making a determination, or wait to see if there is extra money. Fred Hansen mentioned he would rather do more now, as opposed to later.

Commissioner Sam Adams brought up that the committee discussed doing a \$5 million bucket and did not understand why this meeting isn't starting on that foot.

Councilor Rod Park pointed out that it is up to the committee to approve the proposal on the table.

Councilor Brian Newman asked for clarification that the contingency, if there is one, is just on the chance the committee has more money later this spring once the federal legislation has been adopted; the projects are not prioritized and everything starts from scratch with the exception of South Corridor, Washington Commuter Rail and North Macadam access.

Councilor Rod Park agreed that was correct.

Mr. Andy Cotugno pointed out the committee needs to be explicit about what they are adopting.

Councilor Lynn Peterson made a motion to approve Parts 1 and 2, as shown, and Mayor Rob Drake seconded the motion.

### **Part 1: No Net Increase to Base Program**

Approved by JPACT on March 17

Portland trade part of Cully Blvd. for Eastside Streetcar	-\$1.000 \$1.000
Reduce Ledbetter for Capitol Highway	-\$0.100 \$0.100
Portland drop from Lombard/Slough Bridge for Capitol Highway	-\$0.210 \$0.210
Clackamas County authorized to transfer funds from Trolley Trail to 172nd Avenue	-\$0.742 \$0.742
Subtotal Base Program	\$56.908 Million

## **Part 2: Further Amendments to Base Program**

Increase 172nd Avenue	\$2.000
Add to Ledbetter	\$1.000
Add to Sellwood Bridge	\$0.500
Add Powerline Trail	\$0.600
Add Beaverton Hillsdale/Scholls/Oleson	\$1.000
Drop Springwater Trail	-\$1.629
Add Amtrak Station	\$0.900
Add Cleveland Avenue - Gresham	\$1.000
Subtotal Base Program (Target=\$62.2 million)	<hr/> \$62.279 Million

Councilor Lynn Peterson moved a motion to amend the previous motion to include Part 3 as Contingent Commitments (as shown) and Mayor Rob Drake seconded the motion.

## **Part 3: Contingent Commitments Recommended for Approval (pending bill adoption)**

Springwater Trail	\$1.629
Cornelius - 10th Avenue	\$0.837
Gateway TOD	\$0.500
Increase Amtrak Station	\$0.250
Increase Cleveland Avenue – Gresham	\$0.540
Subtotal	<hr/> \$3.756 Million

Commissioner Roy Rogers commented the larger jurisdictions are fighting with a very small amount of money. He pointed out that Washington County is 24 percent of the population and it would be very difficult to support any of the package if Cornelius is not involved in the discussion. He stated the City of Portland has been well taken care of in the package and if Washington County is prioritized any lower than they are already, it would be very difficult for them to approve.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Commissioner Sam Adams requested a friendly amendment and Councilor Lynn Peterson seconded the amendment to say Cornelius Project will be approved as the first contingent commitment and after action is taken, the committee will deal with additional contingent commitments. The motion passed.

Mr. Fred Hansen mentioned that whether or not Cornelius is part of the motion, it would happen. He doesn't think there is any reason to go to the full \$5 million bucket. He is concerned with Gateway TOD. If there is a majority of votes, the project should be included.

Chair Rex Burkholder reminded everyone the motion on the floor is the original motion to adopt Base Program Parts 1 and 2 and a friendly amendment to include Cornelius as the first

Contingent Commitment with a discussion to take place adding up to \$5 million in a contingent bucket.

ACTION TAKEN: Mayor Rob Drake withdrew his second on the motion to amend the motion to include Part 3.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Roy Rogers requested an amendment to the motion and Mayor Rob Drake seconded to include Cornelius project in the Base Program Part 2 with the understanding that the Cornelius Project is funded last, if the funding amount allows. If there isn't funding, the committee will start over with the next MTIP process. The motion passed.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Sam Adams moved and Councilor Brian Newman seconded to substitute the Cully Boulevard project for the Springwater Trail project, resulting in the Springwater Trail project being retained in the base program at \$1.457 million, and Cully Boulevard being dropped from the base program. Commissioner Sam Adams committed that Portland would use city funds to fund the Cully Boulevard project. The motion passed.

Councilor Dave Shields moved and Commissioner Maria Rojo de Steffey seconded to transfer \$540,000 off the MAX Multi-use Path, to the Cleveland Avenue project. He indicated that the portion of the Max Multi-use Path would not be completed and the city would seek the project through the next MTIP process.

Councilor Brian Newman pointed out the MAX Multi-use Path would be going from a 2.3 to 1.0 mile project and would therefore affect the region's ability to meet the air quality target.

Mr. Fred Hansen mentioned that if the committee would be taking money out of a pedestrian/multi-purpose trail for a road project, he would most likely not vote for it because they would not be substituting money, but coming back for more money later.

Councilor Dave Shields pointed out that they would be adding bike trails, sidewalks, but not lanes, which currently are not in Cleveland.

Mr. Ted Leybold stated in terms of meeting requirements to the air quality plan, the committee can only count miles that are in bike lanes and not included in a routine construction project. However, the mileage that has been provided will still meet the overall objective.

Councilor Rod Park expressed concern that the city was applying for funds, being awarded funds, then transferring funds, and then coming back for funds in next MTIP process.

Councilor Dave Shields stated the proposal shows they have moved money around without making extensive commitments. He is receiving pressure about whether he will come back for more money, which puts him in awkward position.

Chair Rex Burkholder pointed out Clackamas County was asked to commit funds, along with the City of Portland for the projects they are proposed to transfer funds off of. He stated the

committee could make shifts if the jurisdiction has other money to accomplish the task that was previously awarded money.

Mr. Dick Pedersen expressed concern that after the committee starts chipping away at the 40 percent, then the 40 percent gets lower and felt the criteria might be changing as the committee makes it's way thru this process.

Councilor Brian Newman stated he did not see a problem moving money, yet he feels nervous about "bait and switch". If the jurisdictions do not make a commitment to fund the project, they will come back to the committee.

Commissioner Maria Rojo de Steffey mentioned when the committee first started, they said jurisdictions could come back and ask to switch projects. She does not remember commitments from jurisdictions to switch funds from their side.

Commissioner Steve Stuart asked what the result would be with funding the project at \$1 million as opposed to \$1.54 million.

Councilor Dave Shields replied the project would not be accomplished, it ties the whole region into the regional center, creating a situation that has not been used in the past. He mentioned if you make switches, then you have to make a commitment, therefore he would withdraw his motion, asking in return that the Cleveland Avenue project moves up in the contingency plan.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Councilor Dave Shields withdrew his motion.

Commissioner Bill Kennemer moved and Councilor Lynn Peterson seconded to amend footnote #1 as follows "Funds are allocated to the Trolley Trail but may be transferred to the 172nd project if an alternate funding source for Segments 5 and 6 is committed. If the intended sewer project does not happen in a timely manner Clackamas County will pursue other county, regional, state or federal funds to finance this priority trail project."

Mr. Andy Cotugno clarified the footnote says money will stay on the Trolley Trail project, but provided terms for which it can be transferred off of the project.

Commissioner Bill Kennemer stated his intent is broader than that and indicated his intention is to transfer money off of the Trolley Trail and on to 172nd.

Ms. Robin McArthur expressed confusion about what the amendment does and what the intent is.

Commissioner Bill Kennemer replied the intent is to put money on 172<sup>nd</sup> and will make every attempt to fund the Trolley Trail project.

Commissioner Maria Rojo de Steffey pointed out that that was what Mr. Councilor Dave Shields was trying to do with his amendment.

Chair Rex Burkholder clarified by saying money was dedicated to the Trolley Trail, but if money is available, than it can go to the 172<sup>nd</sup> project.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Bill Kennemer withdrew his motion, stating the footnote did not allow for what he was seeking. He made a new motion to transfer the money off of the Trolley Trail project and onto the 172<sup>nd</sup> project, with county commitment to seek other federal, state, regional, and local funds for trolley trail. Motion died for lack of a second to the motion.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Sam Adams moved to amend motion and Councilor Rod Park seconded to transfer \$220,000 from Springwater Trail project, resulting in its funding being reduced from \$1.457 million to \$1.237 million. Transfer funds to Capital Highway, increasing funds to \$530,000. Commissioner Sam Adams committed the city would provide local funds to complete the Springwater Trail project. The motion passed.

ACTION TAKEN: Commissioner Bill Kennemer moved to amend footnote and Councilor Lynn Peterson seconded to include previous language and if they find money for the Trolley Trail project, then they can move money to 172<sup>nd</sup>. The motion passed.

ACTION TAKEN: Councilor Dave Shields made a motion and Commissioner Maria Rojo de Steffey seconded to remove footnote on Cleveland Avenue to allow funds to be used on the full project, not just a portion in the regional center as long as portion of the regional center has been completed. The motion passed.

Mr. Andy Cotugno recapped all of the amendments to the main motion that were approved as follows:

Springwater Trail	\$ 1.237	Million
Trolley Trail	\$ 0.742	Million
Powerline Trail	\$ 0.600	Million
Capitol Highway	\$ 0.530	Million
S. Metro Amtrak Station	\$ 0.900	Million
Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway	\$ 1.000	Million
S.E. 172 <sup>nd</sup>	\$ 2.000	Million
Cornelius – 10 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	\$ 0.837	Million
Cleveland Avenuen	\$ 1.000	Million
N. Ledbetter ext	\$ 1.800	Million
Sellwood Bridge	\$ 2.000	Million
N.E. Cully Boulevard	\$ 0.000	Million

ACTION TAKEN: Chair Rex Burkholder asked members to vote for the main motion, Resolution No. 05-3529, as amended. The motion passed.

JPACT provided direction to TPAC to develop a recommendation for up to \$5.0 million of prioritized contingent commitments (inclusive of the \$.837 million contingent commitment to the Cornelius 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue project) in the event an increased funding level is available through the reauthorization of TEA-21. The recommendation should first be limited to consideration from among the following projects:

1. Increase the allocation to the Amtrak Station by \$.25 million
2. Increase the allocation to SE Cleveland Avenue by \$.54 million
3. Increase the allocation to the Marine Drive Bike lanes by \$.685
4. Allocate funds toward the Willamette Shore Preliminary Engineering and/or the Milwaukie EIS by \$.6 million
5. Allocate to the Wood Village Blvd. project \$.45 million

A limited amount above these may be considered by TPAC from the original Options A and B recommended by TPAC.

IV. ADJOURN

As there was no further business, Chair Rex Burkholder adjourned the meeting at 8:59am

Respectfully submitted,

Melanie Briggs  
Recording Secretary

# M E M O R A N D U M

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE | PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736  
TEL 503 797 1700 | FAX 503 797 1794



**METRO**

DATE: April 7, 2005  
TO: JPACT  
FROM: Andy Cotugno  
RE: Washington, D.C. Lobby Trip

At the April 14<sup>th</sup> JPACT meeting, we would like feedback from JPACT on aspects of the DC lobby trip that work well and those that could use improvement. Please come prepared to discuss the following:

1. Are there too many participants? Should the number of attendees be limited?
2. Are there too many projects? Should there be a smaller list or some statement of priorities among the projects?
3. Next year will not be a reauthorization year, so opportunities for earmarking through appropriations will be much more limited. Should we be more targeted in our priorities?
4. Does the meeting/presentation format work?
5. Were our print materials appropriate?
6. Did the reception format on the hill rather than in a hotel work better? Should we reinstate the dinner?
7. Should there be an attempt to coordinate hotel locations to allow for more interchange between JPACT reps?
8. Was the lunch speaker useful (Mayor of Seattle)? Are there any suggestions for future speakers?
9. Other suggestions?

## TEA-LU Earmarks

### High Priority Highway Projects

750	Highway 217	\$ 10.0 million
864	I-5/99W Connector	0.25
1495	Sellwood Bridge	3.0
1524	Barber Street – Wilsonville	3.0
2674	Boechman Road – Wilsonville	1.0
1820	102 <sup>nd</sup> Boulevard – Gateway	4.7
1859	E. Burnside <sup>1</sup>	5.7
1978	Rockwood Town Center	3.0
2134	Columbia Intermodal Corridor	12.0
2310	N. Macadam Access	9.0
2326	Lake Road – Milwaukie	5.0
2467	I-205/213 Interchange	1.0
2625	Sunrise Corridor <sup>2</sup>	4.0
2740	Tualatin Wildlife Refuge Access	0.8
2967	US 26 Study – Highway 217 to Cornelius Pass	1.0
3154	Regional Trails Program <sup>3</sup>	6.0
3225	I-205 Widening	2.0
3537	Capitalize Oregon Transportation Infrastructure Bank	3.998

#### I-5 – Delta Park:

667	I-5 SB Lane – I-5 Delta Park (Washington Share)	\$ 5.0	} \$10.0
3087	Widen I-5 between Portland & Vancouver (Oregon Share)	5.0	

#### I-5 – Columbia Crossing:

1423	PE/EIS for Columbia River Crossing (Washington Share)	12.854	} \$18.854
2458	I-5 Trade Corridor (Oregon Share)	6.0	

**Highway Subtotal** **\$ 104.302 million**

### High Priority Transit Projects

16	Union Station	\$ 0.1 million
99	Gresham MAX Station	1.4
216	Wilsonville SMART Bus Facilities	0.3
443	TriMet Bus Replacement	1.2

**Transit Subtotal** **\$ 3.0 million**

**GRAND TOTAL** **\$ 107.302 million**

---

<sup>1</sup> Portion intended for Eastside Streetcar

<sup>2</sup> \$1.0 million intended for Damascus planning

<sup>3</sup> \$1.0 million intended for Portland-To-Eugene Bikeway



**Bi-State Coordination Committee**  
**2004 Annual Report**  
**Summary**

During 2004, the Bi-State Coordination Committee accomplished the following:

- Transitioned from the Bi-State Transportation Committee to the Bi-State Coordination Committee. This change was approved through consideration of a Bi-State Coordination Committee Charter by member agencies including the cities of Vancouver, Washington and Portland, Oregon, Clark County Washington and Multnomah County Oregon, the Port of Vancouver, the Port of Portland, the Oregon Transportation Commission and the Washington State Department of Transportation, CTRAN and TriMet. This change marked a wider portfolio for the committee that includes land use as well as transportation issues of bi-state significance as well as economic development and environmental justice issues of bi-state significance as they may relate to land use or transportation.
- Approved Bi-State Coordination Committee by-laws;
- Elected Metro Council Rex Burkholder, Chair, Clark County Commissioner Craig Pridemore, Vice-Chair
- Coordinated Bi-State review of the I-5/Delta Park/Lombard Project;
- Reviewed and discussed and made recommendations concerning:
  - Federal funding reauthorization;
  - I-5 Columbia River Crossing;
  - WSDOT Congestion Relief Project;
  - freight rail update and ORULE coordination;
  - CTRAN 20 Year Strategic Plan;
  - Cascade Station Comprehensive Plan Amendment;

## **January**

During the January reporting period, further progress was made on local adoption of the Bi-State Coordination Committee Charter. The City of Portland and Multnomah and Clark counties approved the Charter in January, as did the Oregon Transportation Commission and the Washington State Department of Transportation.

On January 22, 2003 the Bi-State Transportation Committee met. The agenda included discussion and consideration of Federal transportation funding reauthorization, further discussion of the WSDOT Congestion Relief Study and the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Study Process. The discussion of the Federal funding issue lead to a Committee consensus that the "mega-project" approach should be pursued and that the I-5 Corridor was a project that should be advanced. The discussion of the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Study was concerned with how ODOT and WSDOT would conduct the work, and members voiced their strong interest in having the Bi-State Committee serve as a forum for vetting the process and project approach as well as other policy decisions.

## **February**

During the February reporting period, further progress was made on local adoption of the Bi-State Coordination Committee Charter. The TriMet Board approved the charter, leaving only the Port of Portland and the City of Vancouver to consider the Charter.

The February 26, 2004 Bi-State Transportation Committee was cancelled in order to provide additional time to develop materials concerning the I-5 Transportation and Trade partnership and to review draft bylaws for the new Bi-State Coordination Committee

## **March**

The March 25, 2004 Bi-State Transportation Committee was organized to include the following items: 1) an update on the implementation of the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Strategic Plan and discussion of the decision-making process to be used with the upcoming work on an Alternatives Analysis and environmental impact statement leading to new transportation investments in the corridor; 2) and update on the I-5 Delta Park to Lombard Project; 3) a presentation of the CTRAN 20 year Strategic Plan and upcoming decisions about alternatives; and 4) transition from a Bi-State Transportation Committee to a Bi-State Coordination Committee including bylaws.

## **April**

The April 22, 2004 Bi-State Transportation Committee was held and the following agenda items were included: 1) an update on the I-5 Delta Park to Lombard Project, 2) Bi-State role in the I-5 Columbia River Crossing Project and 3)

consideration of Bi-State Coordination Committee By-Laws and initiation of the Bi-State Coordination Committee.

For the I-5/Delta Park-Lombard update, materials were distributed that included matrices that compared a No-Build alternative with various build alternatives. Staff recommendations included assessments that while adding a lane would result in some reductions in congestion, at least in the short term, such an addition would not provide long-term relief. Staff suggested that improvements in this segment should be thought of as only a portion of other investments which would need to be coordinated with I-5 Delta Park/Lombard improvements. Completion of the environmental analysis was estimated to begin fall 2005.

The April meeting also included a recommendation to the Washington State Transportation Commission and the Oregon Transportation Commission concerning the role of the Bi-State Coordination Committee in the I-5 Columbia River Crossing Project. Discussion of a staff proposal and draft communication and decision making process chart was concluded with the Bi-State Committee approving a motion that a letter should be sent from the Committee that articulated Committee interest in serving as a coordinating body, recognizing that there was a need to have business and citizen representation in formulating recommendations about this project and that interests from an area greater than the bi-state area should also be included.

The final April meeting agenda item was the transition from the Bi-State Transportation Committee to the Bi-State Coordination Committee. This change reflected the approval by member agencies of the Bi-State Charter that added coordination of land use issues of bi-state significance to the charge of making recommendations on transportation issues of bi-state significance.

Revised draft bylaws for the Bi-State Coordination Committee reflecting comments and questions raised in the March meeting were also reviewed and approved by unanimous voice vote of the Committee.

The Committee then took action on selecting officers. Metro Council Rex Burkholder was elected chairman of the new Bi-State Coordination Committee and Clark County Commissioner Craig Pridemore was elected Vice-Chairman. These actions resulted in the dissolving of the Bi-State Transportation Committee and the creation of the Bi-State Coordination Committee. The first meeting of the Bi-State Coordination Committee was scheduled for May 27.

## **May**

Following up on the April 22, 2004 Bi-State Committee meeting, staff prepared a letter that stated the Bi-State Coordination Committee interest in serving as the coordinating body for local jurisdictions on both sides of the Columbia River concerning the I-5/Columbia River Crossing project, recognizing that there was a need to have business and citizen representation in formulating

recommendations about this project and that interests from an area greater than the bi-state area also may be included.

The May 27 Bi-State Coordination Committee agenda, included discussion of Committee goals, a Washington State Congestion Relief update and a presentation about freight rail and bi-state efforts could be coordinated with work being done by the Oregon Rail Users League (ORULE) .

---

### **June**

Following up on the May 27, 2004 Bi-State Committee meeting and discussion of Committee goals, staff worked with the Chair and Vice-Chair to develop the next steps. In addition, work continued to pursue the Bi-State Coordination Committee stated interest in serving as the coordinating body for local jurisdictions on both sides of the Columbia River concerning the I-5/Columbia River Crossing project. The June 24 Bi-State Coordination meeting was cancelled.

### **July**

As the summer progressed, one of the most important issues with regard to the Bi-State Coordination Committee became the upcoming I-5/Columbia River Crossing Project. The Project is intended to take the next steps, as outlined in the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Strategic Plan, including the completion of an environmental impact statement for the river crossing. As the Project spans two states, the Project is being lead on the state level by ODOT and WSDOT. The Bi-State Coordination Committee continued to express its keen interest in coordinating the MPO and local government review and comment for this Project and working with the states. A proposal and draft review and organization chart was prepared by the Bi-State Coordination Committee and presented by Chair Burkholder to the two transportation commissions in joint session.

As additional time was needed for the transportation departments to discuss alternative organization proposals, the July 22 Bi-State meeting was rescheduled for August 10. This provided time for the transportation department proposal to be reviewed and commented on by the Bi-State and to be forwarded in a timely manner to the joint meeting of the transportation commissions in early September.

### **August**

At the August 10 special meeting, ODOT and WSDOT presented a draft proposal to the Bi-State Coordination Committee. The proposal, later presented to a joint meeting of the Oregon Transportation Commission and the Washington State Transportation Commission on September 2, recommended that a I-5 Columbia River Crossing Task Force be formed that would have co-chairs from the business community appointed by the transportation commissions and membership representing public agencies, trucking, neighborhoods, businesses,

community organizations, statewide organizations and environmental organizations serving on the Task Force. The Task Force would meet quarterly during a multi-year period and would respond to and advise the Joint Project Team on technical data leading to an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and provide advice to the Joint Commission Subcommittee throughout the EIS process until the issuance of the Record of Decision. There was substantial concern about the proposal voiced by Bi-State Committee members concerning how the Task Force would coordinate with the metropolitan planning organizations (the Regional Transportation Council of Southwest Washington and JPACT and Metro) as well as apprehension about the Task Force providing technical advice, not policy recommendations. The Chair proposed that the proposal be revised to include the Bi-State Coordination Committee and that the Task Force be chartered to provide policy recommendations.

Kate Dean, ODOT, provided an update about the I-5/Delta Park to Lombard Project, noting that there were four alternatives that would be going into the next phase of the project - Denver Connection -South Side; Denver Connection - North Side; Full Columbia Ramp and a citizen generated alternative - Columbia Connector.

Further, the Bi-State heard a briefing about ORULE, the Oregon Rail Users League, and had a short discussion about how the I-5 Trade and Transportation Partnership Strategic Plan's recommendation for a Rail Forum may be advanced by coordination with the ORULE.

### **September**

The Bi-State Coordination Committee Chair, Rex Burkholder presented a proposal for Bi-State role in the upcoming I-5/Columbia River Crossing Project to the joint meeting of the Oregon Transportation Commission and the Washington State Transportation Commission on September 2. The I-5/Columbia River Crossing Project, as outlined in the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Strategic Plan, will include the completion of an environmental impact statement so that transportation improvements across the River can be built. Based on the commission's discussion and the Bi-State proposal, changes were made in the project review body, called the Columbia River Crossing Task Force, which explicitly includes the full membership of the Bi-State Coordination Committee.

The September 23 Bi-State Coordination Committee included a presentation of the findings of the Washington State DOT's Congestion Relief Study and an update and discussion of the I-5/Columbia River Crossing Project. The meeting was immediately followed by a special meeting with Jenna Dorn, FTA Administrator on transportation progress made in the region and plans for additional improvements in the future.

**October**

The October 28, 2004 Bi-State Coordination Committee meeting was cancelled and a special meeting was proposed for December 2. A proposal has been made to WSDOT and ODOT to invite the Co-Chairs of the I-5 Crossing Task Force to the December 2 Bi-State Coordination Meeting in order acquaint the Co-Chairs with the Coordination Committee and to discuss local hopes and concerns with regard to the I-5 Crossing. In addition, initial, informal discussions have been held concerning methods of better coordinating between southwest Washington and the Metro region.

**November**

Because of scheduling conflicts with Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays and the regular Bi-State meeting on the fourth Thursday of the month, the November meeting was cancelled and a special meeting was scheduled for December 2.

**December**

A special Bi-State Coordination Committee meeting was held December 2. An update on the I-5 Columbia River Crossing was given by Rob DeGraff, Project Co-Director, providing information about the technical reports being completed to prepare for project scoping and notice of intent. Mr. DeGraff talked about several technical issues being studied including tolling of the interstate bridge. In addition, other agenda items included: a view of the 4 alternatives of the Delta Park/Lombard Project; a discussion of bi-state transit service given CTRAN ballot results, a review of the Airport Way Cascade Station Plan (proposed land use and transportation amendments adjacent to I-205) and discussion of next year's meeting schedule. Recommendations were made for further coordination with the Port of Portland and ODOT concerning the Cascade Station amendments to the City of Portland Comprehensive Plan.

M E M O R A N D U M

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE

PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736

TEL 503 797 1700

FAX 503 797 1794



**METRO**

**DATE:** April 5, 2005

**TO:** JPACT and Interested Parties

**FROM:** Tom Kloster, Transportation Planning Manager

**SUBJECT:** Recent Transportation Planning Rule Amendments

---

On March 15, the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) adopted broad revisions to OAR 660.012.0060, the state Transportation Planning Rule. This round of amendments was focused on critical issues raised by the recent Jaqua vs. City of Springfield case that threatened current planning practices for balancing transportation and land use plans. While the LCDC response to the Jaqua case began as "fine tuning" amendments to the TPR, sweeping new provisions were introduced shortly before the draft rule was released for public review on January 3, 2005. These provisions, and Metro's position on the changes are discussed in this memorandum.

### **The 1/2 Mile Rule**

The amended TPR reaffirms the existing practice of evaluating land use and transportation plan amendments for their effects in the horizon year of adopted 20-year plans in response to the Jaqua decision. However, the amended rule also applies a special test for transportation system adequacy along certain interstate highway corridors that creates a bar so high that the practical effect will be a zoning freeze in many of the affected areas of the metropolitan region. Known as the "1/2 mile rule", this provision represents a major shift in policy that Metro believes unacceptable because of the effects on the region's ability to implement the 2040 Growth Concept in these corridors.

The 1/2 mile rule requires plan amendments within a half mile radius of interchanges on I-5, I-205, I-405 and I-84 to be evaluated according to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) "financially constrained" system, a set of improvements that represents just over one third of the needed projects in the region. Metro's analysis of the financially constrained system showed that most of the interstate system in the region would fail to meet the RTP level of service

policy in the 2020 horizon year with this limited set of improvements. The net effect would be a cap on plan amendments in affected areas that where added housing or employment might be proposed.

This means that zoning to increase employment or housing densities could be blocked in the Portland Central City, Gateway, Clackamas and Oregon City regional centers, Hollywood, Lents, West Linn, Tualatin and Wilsonville town centers and every station community along the Interstate, Airport and I-205 MAX lines. The inner portions of the Banfield MAX line are also affected. In many cases, local zoning that implements these 2040 designations hasn't been adopted yet, so the impact is dramatic along the Interstate and I-205 MAX corridors, in particular. In the Tualatin/Wilsonville area and Gresham's Springwater employment area, planned industry on land recently brought inside the urban growth boundary could be affected. In Metro's preliminary analysis, the rule affects more than 24,000 acres in these corridors, of which more than 8,000 areas fall into 2040 centers, station communities and main streets, alone.

While Metro shares the state's interest in protecting the integrity of the interstate highway system, we also believe this goal can be much more effectively achieved through more thoughtful strategies that are coordinated with adopted land use and transportation plans.

### **ODOT as a Land Use Authority**

The caveat to the 1/2 mile rule is that ODOT staff will be allowed to determine if additional improvements beyond the RTP financially constrained system are deemed "reasonably likely" to occur, a discretionary interpretation that would occur outside the planning process, and put ODOT staff in the position of deciding land use actions in affected areas. This provision represents a departure from Oregon's planning tradition where local elected officials adopt comprehensive plans in a public process intended to provide certainty in the development process. The effect of this provision would be to allow ODOT to make discretionary, arbitrary decisions that second-guess local policy makers on major planning decisions.

It's also unclear how this could be applied in our region, since most of the affected highway corridors are deferred to refinement plans, and have no major improvements identified in the RTP until individual corridor plans are complete. Thus, ODOT staff would be in the position of choosing projects that don't exist in the RTP in order to use this provision to "approve" plan amendments. This determination by ODOT requires no public process for evaluating the merit or impacts of such projects.

Metro opposes the "reasonably likely" provisions because it places ODOT in an inappropriate role as decision maker in the planning process, and could undermine the region's effort to concentrate future growth in existing urban centers and corridors in an effort to reduce urban sprawl. Metro is currently evaluating options for appealing or revising these recent TPR amendments.

*For more information on Metro's response to the TPR amendments, feel free to contact me at 503-797-1832 or by e-mail to [klostert@metro.dst.or.us](mailto:klostert@metro.dst.or.us).*



M E M O R A N D U M

600 NORTHEAST GRAND AVENUE PORTLAND, OREGON 97232 2736  
TEL 503 797 1700 FAX 503 797 1794



**METRO**

Date: April 7, 2005  
TO: JPACT and Interested Parties  
FROM: Andrew C. Cotugno, Planning Director  
SUBJECT: ODOT Local Consultation Survey

---

The attached letter and survey have been distributed to elected officials throughout the state of Oregon, asking for input on the effectiveness of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) consultation efforts with local governments.

As a member of the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), coordination and consultation with ODOT occurs on a regular basis. For this reason, JPACT members are requested to fill out the survey, noting your participation on JPACT. ODOT agreed to extend the deadline for submitting the survey by one month.

Please submit your completed survey directly to Lucia Ramirez in ODOT's Planning Section by April 30, 2005 at:

Lucia Ramirez  
ODOT  
Transportation Development Division  
Mill Creek Office Building  
555 13th Street NE, Suite 2  
Salem, Oregon 97301-4178

Questions about the survey may also be directed to Lucia at (503) 986-4168 or [lucia.l.ramirez@odot.state.or.us](mailto:lucia.l.ramirez@odot.state.or.us).

Attachments



# Oregon

Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

Department of Transportation  
Transportation Development Division  
Mill Creek Office Building  
555 13th Street NE, Suite 2  
Salem, OR 97301-4178

March 10, 2005

FILE CODE:

Council President David Bragdon  
600 NE Grand Ave  
Portland, OR 97232

Dear Council President Bragdon:

The purpose of this survey is to determine the effectiveness of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) regarding:

- Conferring with affected local officials in accordance with established processes;
- Considering the views of local officials before taking action;
- And periodically informing local officials about actions taken, as per the federal statewide planning regulations in 23 CFR 450.

This survey is being sent to you as an elected official of one of Oregon's cities and counties. Your participation is requested to help us determine our effectiveness in implementing federal statewide planning regulations per 23 CFR 450. This regulation is intended to ensure communication between state and local officials relating to statewide transportation planning and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The regulation provides a role for local elected officials and recognizes that there may be a real or perceived gap in equity between the way MPOs work with ODOT and the ways in which local officials work with the state transportation agency in planning and programming processes.

The questions in this survey ask about your experiences with statewide transportation planning and STIP development. Statewide transportation planning refers to your participation in activities such as updates or amendments to the *Oregon Transportation Plan* or any of its component plans, such as the *Oregon Highway Plan* or the *Oregon Public Transportation Plan*. It also includes your experiences working with the agency in the development of facility plans; for example, a local transportation system plan or a refinement plan for a specific area. STIP development refers to the process of developing and prioritizing projects for inclusion in the STIP.

Your feedback is important. Your responses to this survey will help ODOT understand if the agency's current communication processes are working effectively to engage local officials in transportation planning and STIP development throughout its statewide service area. Your responses will also help highlight areas of ODOT's existing consultation processes that may need improvement and point to what is currently working the best. ODOT will compile the responses and report the collective results to the

Oregon Transportation Commission and the Federal Highway Administration. Individual responses will not be identified with the jurisdiction or individual sending them. There is a space at the end of the survey to provide your name and phone number for any follow-up discussions. Providing this information is optional.

We appreciate your time to complete and return this survey. If you have any questions, you may call Lucia Ramirez in ODOT's Planning Section at 503-986-4168. Please return the survey by March 31, 2005.

You are also welcome to make any other comments about the effectiveness of ODOT's consultation policies. These are listed in a table enclosed for your information. The table also lists web locations where you can review the policies. We will accept comments to include in this review until April 15, 2005. You can include these with the returned survey or forward them to [lucia.l.ramirez@odot.state.or.us](mailto:lucia.l.ramirez@odot.state.or.us).

## ODOT Local Consultation Survey

1. Please circle your level of involvement in transportation planning.

- a. Highly involved   b. Involved   c. Somewhat Involved   d. Not Involved

Additional comments:

---

---

---

2. How would you rate the effectiveness of information/materials you are provided with to make informed decisions impacting transportation planning?

1. Very effective   2. Effective   3. Somewhat Effective   4. Not Effective

Do you have any suggestions for improvement?

---

---

---

3. How effective is each method in incorporating city/county input into the statewide transportation planning process? (1. Very Effective 2. Effective 3. Somewhat effective 4. Not Effective)

City/County staff meetings with ODOT staff.	1	2	3	4
City/County officials meetings with ODOT staff.	1	2	3	4
ODOT staff at City/County Board Meetings.	1	2	3	4
City/County participation through the ACT?	1	2	3	4
City/County participation through other intergovernmental groups?	1	2	3	4
Other _____	1	2	3	4

4. Please circle your level of involvement in STIP development.

- a. Highly involved   b. Involved   c. Somewhat Involved   d. Not Involved

Additional comments:

---

---

---

5. How would you rate the effectiveness of information/materials you are provided to make informed decisions affecting STIP development?

1. Very effective   2. Effective   3. Somewhat Effective   4. Not Effective

Do you have any suggestions for improvement?

---

---

---

## ODOT Local Consultation Survey

6. How effective is each method in incorporating city/county input into the development of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)? (1. *Very Effective* 2. *Effective* 3. *Somewhat effective* 4. *Not Effective*)

City/County staff meetings with ODOT staff.	1	2	3	4
City/County officials meetings with ODOT staff.	1	2	3	4
ODOT staff at City/County Board Meetings.	1	2	3	4
City/County participation through the ACT?	1	2	3	4
City/County participation through other intergovernmental groups?	1	2	3	4
Other _____	1	2	3	4

7. Overall, how would you rate ODOT's current consultation process for transportation issues? (i.e., how well ODOT confers with your jurisdiction, considers input provided, and informs your jurisdiction about decisions or actions.)

1. Very effective    2. Effective    3. Somewhat Effective    4. Not Effective

What do you think would strengthen the consultation process?

---



---



---

8. How would you describe the communication and coordination between you and your neighboring Area Commissions on Transportation and/or Metropolitan Planning Organizations?

1. Very effective    2. Effective    3. Somewhat Effective    4. Not Effective

How would you improve the communication and coordination?

---



---



---

9. How would you describe the effectiveness of your involvement with decisions regarding statewide transportation planning?

1. Very effective    2. Effective    3. Somewhat Effective    4. Not Effective

Do you have any suggestions for improvement?

---



---



---

10. How would you describe the effectiveness of your involvement with decisions regarding projects in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program?

1. Very effective    2. Effective    3. Somewhat Effective    4. Not Effective

Do you have any suggestions for improvement?

## ODOT Local Consultation Survey

---

---

---

11. Are you aware of other transportation consultation issues that have not been discussed in this survey? Please list them and rank their priority from high (1) to low (5).

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_

*Information to help place your responses in context:*

12. If you represent a city, which best describes the population of your city?

- a. less than 5,000   b. between 5,000 and 10,000   c. between 10,000 and 25,000  
d. between 25,000 and 50,000   e. between 50,000 and 200,000   f. greater than 200,000

13. If you represent a county, which best describes the population of your county?

- a. less than 25,000   b. between 25,000 and 50,000   c. between 50,000 and 100,000  
d. between 100,000 and 250,000   e. greater than 250,000

14. Is your jurisdiction part of an MPO?

- a. Yes   b. No   C. Part of jurisdiction is in an MPO

15. Is your jurisdiction part of an ACT?

- a. Yes   b. No   C. Part of jurisdiction is in an ACT

16. Do you consider your city/county urban or rural?

- a. Urban   b. Rural

*Optional:*

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Jurisdiction: \_\_\_\_\_

Can we call you to follow up?   a. Yes   b. No   Phone (if yes) \_\_\_\_\_

**Documentation of Local Official Consultation**  
**Oregon Department of Transportation**  
March 3, 2005

<b>Consultation Practice</b>	<b>Oregon Revised Statute or Executive Order</b>	<b>OTC Plan Policy Appointment or Program</b>	<b>Administrative Rule</b>	<b>Advisory Group</b>	<b>Internal and Local Government Resource</b>	<b>Location/Availability</b>
Local Officials Advisory Committee (Miscellaneous Contracts & Agreements No. 6766)		X		X		ODOT General Files and History Center (503) 986-3286
Public Involvement Policies and Procedures (for long range plans & STIP)		X				<a href="http://www.odot.state.or.us/stip/">http://www.odot.state.or.us/stip/</a>
Area Commissions on Transportation		X		X		<a href="http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/COMM/act_main.shtml">http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/COMM/act_main.shtml</a>
Policy on Formation and Operation of the Area Commissions on Transportation		X			X	<a href="http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/COMM/act_main.shtml">http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/COMM/act_main.shtml</a>
Oregon Transportation Plan		X				<a href="http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/OTP.shtml">http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/OTP.shtml</a> and <a href="http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/ortransplanupdate.shtml">http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/ortransplanupdate.shtml</a>
1999 Oregon Highway Plan		X				<a href="http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/orhwyplan.shtml">http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/orhwyplan.shtml</a>
1997 Oregon Public Transportation Plan		X				<a href="http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/OTPT.shtml">http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/OTPT.shtml</a>
1995 Transportation Safety Action Plan		X				<a href="http://www.odot.state.or.us/transafety/">http://www.odot.state.or.us/transafety/</a>
Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan		X				<a href="http://www.odot.state.or.us/techserv/bikewalk/localprg.htm">http://www.odot.state.or.us/techserv/bikewalk/localprg.htm</a>
2001 Oregon Rail Plan		X				<a href="http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RAIL/docs/raiplan01.pdf">http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RAIL/docs/raiplan01.pdf</a>
Transportation and Growth Management Program		X				<a href="http://www.oregon.gov/LCD/TGM/index.shtml">http://www.oregon.gov/LCD/TGM/index.shtml</a>
Local Programs Oversight Committee				X	X	<a href="http://www.odot.state.or.us/lgs/index.html">http://www.odot.state.or.us/lgs/index.html</a>

**Documentation of Local Official Consultation**  
**Oregon Department of Transportation**  
March 3, 2005

Consultation Practice	Oregon Revised Statute or Executive Order	OTC Plan, Policy Appointment or Program	Administrative Rule	Advisory Group	Internal and Local Government Resource	Location/Availability
Transportation Enhancement Advisory Committee		X		X		<a href="http://www.odot.state.or.us/techserv/engineer/">http://www.odot.state.or.us/techserv/engineer/</a>
Public Transportation Advisory Committee		X		X		<a href="http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/PT/">http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/PT/</a>
Oregon Traffic Control Devices Committee		X		X		<a href="http://www.odot.state.or.us/traffic/">http://www.odot.state.or.us/traffic/</a>
STIP Process Stakeholder Committee (Committee work concluded fall 2003)		X		X		<a href="http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/stip/Cmte.shtml">http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/stip/Cmte.shtml</a>
Oregon Passenger Rail Advisory Council		X		X		<a href="http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RAIL/passengerlinks.shtml">http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RAIL/passengerlinks.shtml</a>
Oregon Transportation Commission (ORS 184.610 to 184.666)	X					<a href="http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors">http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors</a>
Road User Fee Task Force (ORS 184.666)	X			X		<a href="http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors">http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors</a>
House Bill 2041 (2003 State Legislative Session)	X					<a href="http://www.leg.state.or.us/searchmeas.html">http://www.leg.state.or.us/searchmeas.html</a>
Historic Columbia River Highway Advisory Committee (ORS 366.550)	X			X		<a href="http://www.odot.state.or.us/hcrh/adcom/adcom.htm">http://www.odot.state.or.us/hcrh/adcom/adcom.htm</a>
Freight Advisory Committee (HB 3364, 2001 State Legislative Session, made a part of ORS 366)	X			X		<a href="http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/FREIGHT/">http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/FREIGHT/</a> and <a href="http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/">http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/</a>
Governor's Oregon Transportation Safety Committee (ORS 802.300)	X			X		<a href="http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TS/">http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TS/</a>
Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (ORS 366.112)	X			X		<a href="http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/">http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/</a> and <a href="http://www.odot.state.or.us/techserv/bikewalk/opbcpage.htm">http://www.odot.state.or.us/techserv/bikewalk/opbcpage.htm</a>



**Documentation of Local Official Consultation**  
**Oregon Department of Transportation**  
 March 3, 2005

Consultation Practice	Oregon Revised Statute or Executive Order	OTC Plan, Policy Appointment or Program	Administrative Rule	Advisory Group	Internal and Local Government Resources	Location/Availability
Government to Government Relations (ORS182.162-168) (Executive Order EO-96-30)	X					<a href="http://www.leg.state.or.us/cis/">http://www.leg.state.or.us/cis/</a>
Governor's Economic Revitalization Team (House Bill 2011, 2003 State Legislature) (Formerly Community Solutions Team, Executive Order EO-00-23)	X					<a href="http://www.leg.state.or.us/">http://www.leg.state.or.us/</a> and <a href="http://www.gert.oregon.gov/">http://www.gert.oregon.gov/</a>
Scenic Byways Program Advisory Committee (OAR 734-032-000 through 0070)		X	X	X		<a href="http://www.odot.state.or.us/techserv/engineer/pdu/SCENIC/Scenic.htm">http://www.odot.state.or.us/techserv/engineer/pdu/SCENIC/Scenic.htm</a> and <a href="http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/banners/rules.htm">http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/banners/rules.htm</a>
State Agency Coordination Program (OAR 731-015-000 through 135)			X			<a href="http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/banners/rules.htm">http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/banners/rules.htm</a>
Transportation Planning Rule (OAR 660-12-0000 through 0070)			X			<a href="http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/banners/rules.htm">http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/banners/rules.htm</a>
Access Management Rules (OAR 734-051)			X			<a href="http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/banners/rules.htm">http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/banners/rules.htm</a>
Access Management Manual and Development Review Guidelines (Implements OAR 734-051)					X	<a href="http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/">http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/</a>
Transportation System Planning Guidelines (Implements the TPR)					X	<a href="http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/">http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/</a>
1999 Oregon Highway Plan Jurisdictional Transfer Handbook, <i>Transferring Roads</i>					X	<a href="http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/orhwyplan.shtml">http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/orhwyplan.shtml</a>
Transportation Data					X	<a href="http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TDAT/A/">http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TDAT/A/</a>

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING THE )  
FY 2006 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK )  
PROGRAM )

RESOLUTION NO. 05-3541

Introduced by Councilor Rex Burkholder

WHEREAS, the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) as shown in Exhibit A, describes all federally-funded transportation planning activities for the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area to be conducted in FY 2006; and

WHEREAS, the FY 2006 UPWP indicates federal funding sources for transportation planning activities carried out by Metro, Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council, Oregon Department of Transportation, TriMet, SMART and the local jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, approval of the FY 2006 UPWP is required to receive federal transportation planning funds; and

WHEREAS, the FY 2006 UPWP is consistent with the proposed Metro budget submitted to the Metro Council; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Metro Council hereby declares:

1. That the FY 2006 UPWP is approved.
2. That the FY 2006 UPWP is consistent with the continuing, cooperative and comprehensive planning process and is given positive Intergovernmental Project Review action.
3. That Metro's Chief Operating Officer is authorized to apply for, accept and execute grants and agreements specified in the UPWP.
4. That staff shall update the UPWP budget figures, as necessary, to reflect the final Metro budget.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_\_ day of April 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to form:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

## STAFF REPORT

### CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 05-3541 FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING THE FY 2006 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

Date: April 1, 2005

Presented by: Andrew C. Cotugno

## PROPOSED ACTION

This resolution would: 1) approve the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) continuing the transportation planning work program for FY 2006; and 2) authorize submittal of grant applications to the appropriate funding agencies.

## EXISTING LAW

Federal transportation agencies (Federal Transit Administration [FTA] and Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]) require an adopted UPWP as a prerequisite for receiving federal funds.

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The FY 2006 UPWP describes transportation planning activities to be carried out in the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan region during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2005. Included in the document are federally funded studies to be conducted by Metro, Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC), the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), TriMet, SMART, the Portland of Portland, and local jurisdictions. Continuing commitments include implementing the adopted Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), identifying solutions to improve goods flow in the I-5 Corridor; initiating the Milwaukie LRT and the next corridor studies, and increasing the communication of transportation system performance, needs and proposed plans. In addition, it continues a greater emphasis on freight planning and further advancements in travel modeling in cooperation with Los Alamos National Laboratories. Environmental Justice also will be an emphasis area.

## BUDGET IMPACT

The UPWP matches the projects and studies reflected in the proposed Metro budget submitted by the Metro Chief Operating Officer to the Metro Council and is subject to revision in the final Metro budget. This resolution also directs staff to update the UPWP budget figures, as necessary, to reflect the final Metro budget.

Approval will mean that grants can be submitted and contracts executed so work can commence on July 1, 2005, in accordance established Metro priorities.

---

# **FY 2005-06**

# **Unified Planning Work Program**

---

## **Transportation Planning in the Portland/Vancouver Metropolitan Area**

Metro  
City of Portland  
City of Wilsonville (SMART)  
Washington County  
Port of Portland  
TriMet Oregon  
Department of Transportation  
Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council

Adopted

---

The complete UPWP may be accessed online at:

<http://www.metro-region.org/article.cfm?articleid=12581>

JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE  
METRO COUNCIL  
AND  
OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FOR THE PURPOSE OF CERTIFYING THAT	)	RESOLUTION NO. 05-3542
THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA IS IN	)	
COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL	)	Introduced by Councilor Rex Burkholder
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING	)	
REQUIREMENTS	)	

WHEREAS, substantial federal funding from the Federal Transit Administration and Federal Highway Administration is available to the Portland metropolitan area; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Transit Administration and Federal Highway Administration require that the planning process for the use of these funds complies with certain requirements as a prerequisite for receipt of such funds; and

WHEREAS, satisfaction of the various requirements is documented in Exhibit A; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the transportation planning process for the Portland metropolitan area (Oregon portion) is in compliance with federal requirements as defined in Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 450, and Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 613.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_\_ day of April 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to form:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

APPROVED by the Oregon Department of Transportation this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_  
2005.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Craig Greenleaf  
Transportation Development Administrator

## STAFF REPORT

### CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 05-3542 FOR THE PURPOSE OF CERTIFYING THAT THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING REQUIREMENTS

Date: April 1, 2005

Presented by: Andrew C. Cotugno

## PROPOSED ACTION

This resolution certifies that the Portland metropolitan area is in compliance with federal transportation planning requirements as defined in Title 2.3, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 450 and Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 613.

## EXISTING LAW

Federal transportation agencies (Federal Transit Administration [FTA] and Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]) require a self-certification that our planning process is in compliance with certain federal requirements as a prerequisite to receiving federal funds. The self-certification documents that we have met those requirements and is considered yearly at the time of Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) approval.

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Required self certification areas include:

- Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) designation
- Geographic scope
- Agreements
- Responsibilities, cooperation and coordination
- Metropolitan Transportation Planning products
- Planning factors
- Public Involvement
- Title VI
- Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE)
- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)

Each of these areas is discussed in Exhibit A to Resolution No. 05-3542.

## BUDGET IMPACT

Approval of this resolution is a companion to the UPWP. It is a prerequisite to receipt of federal planning funds and is, therefore, critical to the Metro budget. The UPWP matches projects and studies reflected in the proposed Metro budget submitted by the Metro Chief Operating Officer to the Metro Council and is subject to revision in the final adopted Metro budget.

Approval will mean that grants can be submitted and contracts executed so work can commence on July 1, 2005, in accordance established Metro priorities.

## **Metro Self-Certification**

### **1. Metropolitan Planning Organization Designation**

Metro is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) designated by the Governor for the urbanized areas of Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties.

Metro is a regional government with six directly elected district councilors and a regionally elected Council President. Local elected officials of general purpose governments are directly involved in the transportation planning/decision process through the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) (see membership roster). JPACT provides the "forum for cooperative decision-making by principal elected officials of general purpose governments" as required by USDOT and takes action on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) and the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) deals with non-transportation-related matters and with the adoption and amendment to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Specific roles and responsibilities of the committees are described on page 2.

### **2. Geographic Scope**

Transportation planning in the Metro region includes the entire area within the Federal-Aid Urban Boundary.

### **3. Agreements**

- a. A basic memorandum of agreement between Metro and the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC) delineates areas of responsibility and coordination. Executed February 2003, to be updated in 2006.
- b. An agreement between TriMet and Metro implementing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21), executed August 2004, to be updated in 2007.
- c. An agreement between ODOT and Metro implementing the TEA-21, executed September 2004, to be updated in 2007.
- d. Yearly agreements are executed between Metro and ODOT defining the terms and use of FHWA planning funds.
- e. Bi-State Coordination Committee Charter – Metro and 11 state and local agencies adopted resolutions approving a Bi-State Coordination Committee Charter in 2004. Some were adopted in late 2003 and the balance in 2004, which triggered the transition from the Bi-State Transportation Committee to the Bi-State Coordination Committee.
- f. An agreement between Metro and the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) describing each agency's responsibilities and roles for air quality planning. Executed August 2004, to be updated in 2007.
- g. Metro and Wilsonville are discussing conditions for the MOU. A two-year agreement will be executed prior to July 1, 2005. A two-year agreement will put it on the same time as the others.

#### **4. Responsibilities, Cooperation and Coordination**

Metro uses a decision-making structure, which provides state, regional and local governments the opportunity to participate in the transportation and land use decisions of the organization. The two key committees are JPACT and MPAC. These committees receive recommendations from the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC).

##### **JPACT**

This committee is comprised of three Metro Councilors; nine local elected officials including two from Clark County, Washington, and appointed officials from ODOT, TriMet, the Port of Portland and DEQ. All transportation-related actions (including federal MPO actions) are recommended by JPACT to the Metro Council. The Metro Council can approve the recommendations or refer them back to JPACT with a specific concern for reconsideration. Final approval of each item, therefore, requires the concurrence of both bodies.

##### **Bi-State Coordination Committee**

Based on a recommendation from the I-5 Transportation & Trade Partnership Strategic Plan, the Bi-State Transportation Committee became the Bi-State Coordination Committee in early 2004. The Bi-State Coordination Committee was chartered through resolutions approved by Metro, Multnomah County, the cities of Portland and Gresham, TriMet, ODOT, the Port of Portland, RTC, Clark County, C-Tran, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and the Port of Vancouver. The Committee is charged with reviewing all issues of bi-state significance for transportation and land use. A 2003 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) states that JPACT and the RTC Board "shall take no action on an issue of bi-state significance without first referring the issue to the Bi-State Coordination Committee for their consideration and recommendation."

##### **MPAC**

This committee was established by the Metro Charter to provide a vehicle for local government involvement in Metro's planning activities. It includes eleven local elected officials, three appointed officials representing special districts, TriMet, a representative of school districts, three citizens, two non-voting Metro Councilors, two Clark County, Washington representatives and a non-voting appointed official from the State of Oregon. Under the Metro Charter, this committee has responsibility for recommending to the Metro Council adoption of or amendment to any element of the Charter-required RTP.

The Regional Framework Plan was adopted on December 11, 1997 and addresses the following topics:

- Transportation
- Land use (including the Metro Urban Growth Boundary (UGB))
- Open space and parks
- Water supply and watershed management
- Natural hazards
- Coordination with Clark County, Washington
- Management and implementation



In accordance with this requirement, the transportation plan developed to meet Transportation Efficiency Act of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21) the Transportation Planning Rule and Metro Charter requirements will require a recommendation from both MPAC and JPACT. This will ensure proper integration of transportation with land use and environmental concerns.

## **5. Metropolitan Transportation Planning Products**

### **a. Unified Planning Work Program**

JPACT, the Metro Council and the Southwest Washington RTC adopt the UPWP annually. It fully describes work projects planned for the Transportation Department during the fiscal year and is the basis for grant and funding applications. The UPWP also includes federally funded major projects being planned by member jurisdictions. Those projects will be administered by Metro through intergovernmental agreements with ODOT and the sponsoring jurisdiction.

### **b. Regional Transportation Plan**

The 2000 RTP was adopted in August 2000, culminating a two-phase, five-year effort to reorient the plan to Metro's 2040 Growth Concept. The updated plan contains a new emphasis on implementing key aspects of the 2040 land use plan with strategic transportation infrastructure improvements and programs. The plan is fully organized around these land use goals, with modal systems for motor vehicles, transit, freight, bicycles and pedestrians geared to serve the long-term needs called for in the 2040 plan.

The 2000 RTP also includes a new level of detail, prescribing a number of new performance measures and system design standards for the 25 cities and 3 counties in the Metro region to enact. These include: new requirements for local street connectivity; modal orientation in street design; 2040-based level-of-service policy for sizing roads; targets for combined alternative modes of travel; and, parking ratios for new developments. The plan contains nearly 900 individual projects totaling \$7.2 billion in system improvements, and a corresponding series of financing scenarios for funding these projects. It also calls for more than a dozen corridor studies to define specific projects for many of the major corridors where more analysis is needed to determine which improvements best respond to expected demand.

JPACT and the Metro Council approved the RTP 2004 Federal Update on December 11, 2003. The 2004 update was limited in scope, leaving the 2000 RTP requirements unchanged. The update included "housekeeping" amendments to reflect fine-tuning of the various modal system maps, as recommended by local cities and counties through transportation plans adopted since the last RTP update in August 2000. The 2004 RTP includes new policy text that establishes two tiers of industrial areas ("regionally significant" and "local") for the purpose of transportation planning and project funding.

The 2004 update also provided an updated set of financially constrained projects. The total revenue base assumed in the 2004 RTP for the road system is approximately \$4.3 billion, with \$2.16 billion for freeways, highways and roads, \$1.67 billion for transit and the balance for planning, bike, pedestrian, transportation demand management, system management and other similar programs. In addition to the financially constrained system, the 2004 Federal Update identifies a larger set of projects and programs for the "Illustrative System," which is nearly double the scale and cost of the financially constrained system. The illustrative system represents the region's objective for implementing the Region 2040 Plan.

Finally, a new map has been added to Chapter 1 of the RTP that identifies the MPO Planning Boundary. This boundary defines the area that the RTP applies to for federal planning purposes. The boundary includes the area inside Metro's jurisdictional boundary, the 2003 UGB and the 2000 census defined urbanized area boundary for the Portland metropolitan region. FHWA and FTA approved the 2004 RTP and the associated air quality conformity determination on March 5, 2004.

**c. Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program**

The MTIP was updated in spring 2003 and incorporated into ODOT 2004-07 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The 2003 update includes projects or project phases with prior funding commitments and allocated \$50 million of Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality Program (CMAQ). The adopted MTIP features a three-year approved program of projects and a fourth "out-year." The first year of projects are considered the priority year projects. Should any of these be delayed, projects of equivalent dollar value may be advanced from the second and third years of the program without processing formal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) amendments. This flexibility was adopted in response to ISTEA (now TEA-21) planning requirements. The flexibility reduces the need for multiple amendments throughout the year.

**6. Planning Factors**

Metro's planning process addresses the seven TEA-21 planning factors in all projects and policies. The table below describes this relationship. The TEA-21 planning factors are:

1. Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity and efficiency;
2. Increase the safety and security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;
3. Increase the accessibility and mobility options available to people and for freight;
4. Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation and improve quality of life;
5. Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight;
6. Promote efficient management and operations; and
7. Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.

Factor	System Planning (RTP)	Funding Strategy (MTIP)	High Capacity Transit (HCT)
1. Support Economic Vitality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RTP policies linked to land use strategies that promote economic development.</li> <li>• Industrial areas and intermodal facilities identified in policies as "primary" areas of focus for planned improvements.</li> <li>• Comprehensive, multimodal freight improvements that link intermodal facilities to industry are detailed for 20-year plan period.</li> <li>• Highway LOS policy tailored to protect key freight corridors.</li> <li>• RTP recognizes need for freight linkages to destinations beyond the region by all modes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All projects subject to consistency with RTP policies on economic development and promotion of "primary" land use element of 2040 development such as centers, industrial areas and intermodal facilities.</li> <li>• Special category for freight improvements calls out the unique importance for these projects.</li> <li>• All freight projects subject to funding criteria that promotes industrial jobs and businesses in the "traded sector."</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCT plans designed to support continued development of regional centers and central city by increasing transit accessibility to these locations.</li> <li>• HCT improvements in major commute corridors lessen need for major capacity improvements in these locations, allowing for freight improvements in other corridors.</li> </ul>
2. Increase Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RTP policies call out safety as a primary focus for improvements to the system.</li> <li>• Safety is identified as one of three implementation priorities for all modal systems (along with preservation of the system and implementation of the region's 2040-growth management strategy).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All projects ranked according to specific safety criteria.</li> <li>• Road modernization and reconstruction projects are scored according to relative accident incidence.</li> <li>• All projects must be consistent with regional street design guidelines that provide safe designs for all modes of travel.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Station area planning for proposed HCT improvements is primarily driven by pedestrian access and safety considerations.</li> </ul>

Factor	System Planning (RTP)	Funding Strategy (MTIP)	High Capacity Transit (HCT)
3. Increase Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RTP policies are organized on the principle of providing accessibility to centers and employment areas with a balanced, multi-modal transportation system.</li> <li>The policies also identify the need for freight mobility in key freight corridors and to provide freight access to industrial areas and intermodal facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measurable increases in accessibility to priority land use elements of the 2040-growth concept is a criterion for all projects.</li> <li>The MTIP program places a heavy emphasis on non-auto modes in an effort to improve multi-modal accessibility in the region.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The planned HCT improvements in the region will provide increased accessibility to the most congested corridors and centers.</li> <li>Planned HCT improvements provide mobility options to persons traditionally underserved by the transportation system.</li> </ul>
4. Protect Environment and Quality of Life	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RTP is constructed as a transportation strategy for implementing the region's 2040-growth concept. The growth concept is a long-term vision for retaining the region's livability through managed growth.</li> <li>The RTP system has been "sized" to minimize the impact on the built and natural environment.</li> <li>The region has developed an environmental street design guidebook to facilitate environmentally sound transportation improvements in sensitive areas, and to coordinate transportation project development with regional strategies to protect endangered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MTIP conforms to the Clean Air Act.</li> <li>The MTIP focuses on allocating funds for clean air (CMAQ), livability (Transportation Enhancement) and multi- and alternative – modes (STIP).</li> <li>Bridge projects in lieu of culverts have been funded through the MTIP to enhance endangered salmon and steelhead passage.</li> <li>"Green Street" demonstration projects funded to employ new practices for mitigating the effects of storm water runoff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Light rail improvements provide emission-free transportation alternatives to the automobile in some of the region's most congested corridors and centers.</li> <li>HCT transportation alternatives enhance quality of life for residents by providing an alternative to auto travel in congested corridors and centers.</li> </ul>

Factor	System Planning (RTP)	Funding Strategy (MTIP)	High Capacity Transit (HCT)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>species.</li> <li>The RTP conforms to the Clean Air Act.</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many new transit, bicycle, pedestrian and TDM projects have been added to the plan in recent updates to provide a more balanced multi-modal system that maintains livability.</li> <li>RTP transit, bicycle, pedestrian and TDM projects planned for the next 20 years will complement the compact urban form envisioned in the 2040 growth concept by promoting an energy-efficient transportation system.</li> <li>Metro coordinates its system level planning with resource agencies to identify and resolve key issues.</li> </ul>		
5. System Integration/ Connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RTP includes a functional classification system for all modes that establishes an integrated modal hierarchy.</li> <li>The RTP policies and Functional Plan* include a street design element that integrates transportation modes in relation to land use for all regional facilities.</li> <li>The RTP policies and Functional Plan include connectivity provisions that will increase local and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projects funded through the MTIP must be consistent with regional street design guidelines.</li> <li>Freight improvements are evaluated according to potential conflicts with other modes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned HCT improvements are closely integrated with other modes, including pedestrian and bicycle access plans for station areas and park-and-ride and passenger drop-off facilities at major stations.</li> </ul>

Factor	System Planning (RTP)	Funding Strategy (MTIP)	High Capacity Transit (HCT)
	<p>major street connectivity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RTP freight policies and projects address the intermodal connectivity needs at major freight terminals in the region.</li> <li>• The intermodal management system identifies key intermodal links in the region.</li> </ul>		
6. Efficient Management & Operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RTP policy chapter includes specific system management policies aimed at promoting efficient system management and operation.</li> <li>• Proposed RTP projects include many system management improvements along regional corridors.</li> <li>• The RTP financial analysis includes a comprehensive summary of current and anticipated operations and maintenance costs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projects are scored according to relative cost effectiveness (measured as a factor of total project cost compared to measurable project benefits).</li> <li>• TDM projects are solicited in a special category to promote improvements or programs that reduce SOV pressure on congested corridors.</li> <li>• TSM/ITS projects are funded through the MTIP.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed HCT improvements include redesigned feeder bus systems that take advantage of new HCT capacity and reduce the number of redundant transit lines.</li> </ul>
7. System Preservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed RTP projects include major roadway preservation projects.</li> <li>• The RTP financial analysis includes a comprehensive summary of current and anticipated operations and maintenance costs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reconstruction projects that provide long-term maintenance are identified as a funding priority.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RTP financial plan includes the 20-year costs of HCT maintenance and operation for planned HCT systems.</li> </ul>

\* *Functional Plan = Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, an adopted regulation that requires local governments in Metro's jurisdiction to complete certain planning tasks.*

## **7. Public Involvement**

Metro maintains a proactive public involvement process that provides complete information, timely public notice, full public access to key decisions and supports early and continuing involvement of the public in developing its policies, plans and programs. Public Involvement Plans are designed to both support the technical scope and objectives of Metro studies and programs while simultaneously providing for innovative, effective and inclusive opportunities for engagement. Every effort is made to employ broad and diverse methods, tools and activities to reach potentially impacted communities and other neighborhoods and to encourage the participation of low-income and minority citizens and organizations.

All Metro UPWP studies and projects that have a public involvement component require a Public Involvement Plan (PIP) that meets or exceeds adopted public involvement procedures. Included in individualized PIPs are strategies and methods to best involve a diverse citizenry. Some of these may include special public opinion survey mechanisms, translation of materials for non-English speaking members of the community, custom citizen working committees or advisory committee structures, special task forces, web instruments and a broad array of public information materials. For example, given the geographically and philosophically diverse make-up of the South Corridor Study, it was determined that the traditional single citizens advisory committee would not prove effective. Hence, the study incorporated area specific working committees, local advisory committees and assemblies as well as corridor-wide all-assemblies. Hearings, workshops, open houses, charrettes and other activities are also held as needed.

The MTIP relies on early program kick-off notification, inviting input on the development of criteria, project solicitation, project ranking and the recommended program. Workshops, informal and formal opportunities for input as well as a 45-day+ comment period are repetitive aspects of the MTIP process. By assessing census information, block analysis is conducted on areas surrounding each project being considered for funding to ensure that environmental justice principles are met and to identify where additional outreach might be beneficial.

TPAC includes six citizen positions that are geographically and interest area diverse and filled through an open, advertised application and interview process. TPAC makes recommendations to JPACT and the Metro Council.

**Title VI** – In September 2002, Metro submitted to the FTA the 1999-2002 Title VI Compliance report with accompanying mapped demographic information. In December 2004, additional Title VI documentation was submitted to FTA. The report was approved conditionally to allow Metro's grant application to be submitted. The complete report will be submitted prior to July 1, 2005. In addition, FHWA and FTA certified Metro's Public Involvement, Title VI and Environmental Justice processes as part of the October 2001 Metropolitan Transportation Planning and Programming USDOT Certification Review.

**Environmental Justice** – The intent of environmental justice (EJ) practices is to ensure that needs of minority and disadvantaged populations are considered and that the relative benefits/impacts of individual projects on local communities are thoroughly assessed and vetted. Metro continues to expand and explore environmental justice efforts that provide early access to and consideration of planning and project development activities. Metro's EJ program is organized to communicate and seek input on project proposals and to carry those efforts into the analysis, community review and decision-making processes.

**8. Disadvantaged Business Enterprise**

A revised Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) program was adopted by the Metro Council in June 1997 (Ordinance No. 97-692A); 49CFR 26 allows recipients to use the DBE goal of another recipient in the same market. Metro's Executive Officer approved an overall DBE annual goal in accordance with ODOT. This goal was established utilizing ODOT's methodology to determine DBE availability of "ready, willing and able" firms for federally funded professional and construction projects. The current goal is 11.43 percent.

Metro's DBE program was reviewed and determined to be in compliance by FTA after conducting a Triennial Review in August 1999.

**9. Americans with Disabilities Act**

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Joint Complementary Paratransit Plan was adopted by the TriMet Board in December 1991 and was certified as compatible with the RTP by Metro Council in January 1992. The plan was phased in over five years and TriMet has been in compliance since January 1997. Metro approved the 1997 plan as in conformance with the RTP. FTA audited and approved the plan in summer 1999.



**2004 Portland and Vancouver Area Planning Certification Review Report  
Metro Response  
April 5, 2005**

**2004 Review Recommendation 1.** *Because of the recent inclusion of the City of Wilsonville and the emerging City of Damascus in the MPO boundary, the considerable growth of the MPO population in general and public comments indicating a perception that smaller jurisdictions may not be adequately represented in MPO matters, it is recommended that the MPO members review the existing policy board representation and voting structure and either reaffirm its adequacy or agree on appropriate modifications*

**2004 Review Recommendation 2.** *It is strongly recommended that other members also evaluate the effectiveness of SMARTs input opportunities and consider appropriate alternatives.*

**Response:** There has been periodic discussion of expanding the city representation at JPACT as the role of cities in providing transportation facilities and services has grown over the past several years. In 2002-03, the matter was considered in response to a request by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) to expand JPACT membership to include business and freight representatives. JPACT concluded that the committee should continue to consist of elected and appointed public officials, and did not make changes to the operating bylaws at that time. This issue of expanded city representation will be formally discussed at JPACT as part of a review of committee bylaws in the current year work program.

Currently, TriMet is the only transit agency directly represented on JPACT. Clark County's transit authority, C-Tran is indirectly represented on JPACT via the Vancouver and Clark County representatives (who are on the C-TRAN Board) and is directly represented at TPAC, and with TriMet is integrally involved in the development of policy options under consideration by JPACT. However, this issue will also be discussed as part of the bylaws review to explore ways to further improve SMART participation in MPO activities.

**2004 Review Recommendation 3.** *Recommend Metro expedite the completion of updated Federal-Aid Urban Boundary (FAUB) and federal functional classifications. Completion by early January 2005 is critical in order for ODOT to meet FHWA's deadline for submittal of their 2004 HPMS data. Failure to include updated FAUB and functional classifications can reduce the relevance of the HPMS data and validity of resulting analysis.*

**Response:** Metro has completed the FAUB and federal functional classification review.

**2004 Review Recommendation 4.** *Recommend future Transportation System Plan (TSP) updates include a review of federal functional classifications and, with involvement of ODOT, the resolution of any inconsistencies with federal functional classifications prior to TSP adoption.*

**Response:** Metro will add this recommendation to the work program for the next scheduled RTP update in 2006-07. As part of the current federal functional classification review, Metro is recommending that a number of changes proposed by local jurisdictions be deferred to the 2006-07 RTP update in order to be considered comprehensively. These changes include any recommendation that would require a change to the RTP functional classification system, and thus deemed to be a departure from adopted regional policy.

**2004 Review Corrective Action 1.** *Metro needs to develop an agreement with SMART that defines the agencies mutual roles, responsibilities and procedures.*

**Response:** An agreement between SMART and Metro will be executed before July 2005.

**2004 Review Corrective Action 2:** *Metro's next Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) (effective July 1, 2005) shall include data efforts necessary to identify and prioritize congestion bottlenecks; monitor level-of-service during peak and off-peak periods and support other CMS activities. (This might include activities such as ITS data collection for monitoring delay and speed and identifying bottleneck locations, etc.) The UPWP should also include appropriate tasks to correct any CMS deficiencies that might be identified during preparation of a CMS roadmap document.*

**Response:** Metro's 2005-06 Budget and the draft 2005-06 UPWP includes expanded CMS and ITS programs to address this corrective action. The expanded ITS program is simply more resources dedicated to the regional ITS steering committee (TRANSPORT) that Metro already serves on. The expanded CMS program will be developed in conjunction with the next RTP update scheduled to begin in late 2005, and will build on existing CMS features in the plan.

**2004 Review Corrective Action 3:** *Within four months of the date of this report, Metro shall develop a "roadmap" document describing the CMS process in sufficient detail to demonstrate compliance with 23 CFR 450.*

**Response:** Three Metro staff attended NIH training in October 2004 as a first step in expanding the CMS process that currently exists in the RTP. Staff has begun a "roadmap" document, and will present this to FHWA in conjunction with the UPWP on \_\_\_\_\_.

**2004 Review Corrective Action 4:** *Metro shall include appropriate work items in future UPWPs to address CMS deficiencies that might be identified during the documentation process.*

**Response:** The items expected to be part of the CMS "roadmap" are reflected in the draft UPWP.

**2004 Review Corrective Action 5:** *Metro's next UPWP (effective July 1, 2005) shall include tasks necessary to identify and prioritize congestion bottlenecks and monitor level-of-service during peak and off-peak periods.*

**Response:** The draft UPWP includes these tasks.

**2004 Review Recommendation 5:** *It is recommended that Metro include elements in all phases of their planning process that support the ISTEA goals of relieving congestion where it now occurs, preventing congestion where it does not yet occur and improving the mobility of people and goods. This should include performance measures to determine progress toward achieving these goals.*

**Response:** Metro's congestion relief policies and processes for measuring and managing congestion are contained in the RTP, which guides all Metro transportation planning activities. The policy uses a tiered approach for establishing performance expectations for the motor vehicles system, which seeks to improve bottlenecks and maintain off-peak mobility. However, the two-hour peak period policy acknowledges the RTP analysis findings that capacity increases along major corridors will not necessarily improve mobility or relieve congestion during periods of high demand. For these corridors, the RTP policy seeks to improve travel alternatives in

commute corridors, and identify freight corridors where peak period mobility should be considered.

The RTP includes a number of other measures that provide a more complete picture of how periods of heavy motor vehicle travel affect the region, including vehicle miles traveled per capita, which FHWA statistics show are declining in the Portland region – an opposite trend from what most other major cities are experiencing; and a positive indicator that the multi-modal strategy of the RTP, combined with the region's urban growth policies, are reducing the amount of personal driving for area residents.

Metro was selected by FHWA for a congestion pricing pilot project in the late 1990s. While this study demonstrated that pricing was the only viable, long-term strategy for maintaining peak-period mobility along major highway corridors, elected officials also heard strong resistance from area residents to the idea of pricing existing facilities. As a result the RTP requires an examination of congestion pricing as a strategy when new capacity is added to the regional system, but does not recommend the strategy for existing facilities at this time.

Metro's 2040 indicators program already monitors the major travel corridors that make up the CMS network in the RTP, and Metro began reporting monitoring mobility for these corridors in 2004.

**2004 Review Recommendation 6.** *It is recommended that Metro and ODOT continue discussions on procedures necessary to ensure federal requirements are followed by all sub-recipients of federal funds. After agreement is reached, details should be reflected in interagency agreements and the Metro/ODOT MOU.*

**Response:** Discussions are continuing between Metro and ODOT to resolve issues of responsibility. Planning projects by local governments are reflected in this UPWP and will be administered by Metro. Planning on specific street projects necessary to initiate preliminary engineering may also need to be reflected in the UPWP and administered by Metro.

**2004 Review Corrective Action 6.** *Metro's reference to two regional transportation plans is, at best, confusing to the public thus, Metro needs to develop and present a single consolidated 2004 Federal RTP document complete with appendices, within six months from the date of this report.*

**Response:** Metro is in the process of publishing a consolidated version of the 2000 "State" RTP and the 2004 "Federal" RTP. The consolidated document will appear as one plan to the public and serve as the working version, though Metro will retain separate versions of the documents, as adopted, as the public record. The consolidated document is expected to be available in early 2005.

**2004 Review Corrective Action 7.** *As part of the revenue forecasting chapter of Metro's next RTP update, Metro shall expand the discussion and explanation of its member jurisdictions' Operating and Maintenance (O&M) costs in order to better educate the public on the huge costs of operating and maintaining the existing and proposed transportation infrastructure (both transit and roadway) and comply with the spirit of 23 CFR 450.322(b)(11). This explanation should be sufficiently detailed to show annually the source and amount of all expected income and a detailed list of planned expenditures on all projects and activities.*

**Response:** Metro began this work as part of assisting ODOT in an update to the state transportation revenue forecast, and will incorporate the expanded information in the RTP update to include the level of detail specified in this corrective action. More detailed information on revenues and expenditures will be needed from local governments.

**2004 Review Recommendation 7.** *Since the Federal RTP is not effective until after the Metro and USDOT air quality conformity findings are complete, it is recommended that the printed 2004 Federal RTP document show the effective date (in this case March 5, 2004) as well as the adoption date (December 11, 2003).*

**Response:** This recommendation will be reflected in the published version of the RTP, anticipated in early 2005.

**2004 Review Corrective Action 8.** *Metro's next UPWP (due July 1, 2005) needs to include a work schedule showing how completion of the 2007 RTP update will be accomplished prior to the March 5, 2007 due date and any 2005 tasks necessary to support timely completion. The schedule needs to include sufficient time for: a) public review of the RTP content and air quality conformity findings, b) interagency consultation on the Metro and USDOT air quality conformity finds, and c. public review of and completion of the Metro USDOT air quality conformity findings.*

**Response:** The 2005-06 UPWP will include a tentative schedule of RTP activities for the budget year, but a detailed work program is contingent on Metro Council review and approval, which is not scheduled to occur until fall 2005. In lieu of an adopted schedule, the UPWP will anticipate an approximate schedule, with a timeline that ensures that federal components of the UPWP is completed before the plan lapses under the current due date of March 5, 2007. However, Metro is beginning a review of the 2040 Growth Concept that will overlap this time frame, and likely trigger major changes to the RTP that cannot be completed within the current federal update timeline. However, Metro also anticipates a new four-year update cycle in the federal reauthorization, which could extend the due date to March 2008. In this scenario, it could be possible to adopt both the state and federal components of an updated RTP concurrently, depending on the timing and scope of amendments triggered by the 2040 re-evaluation.

**2004 Review Recommendation 8.** *Given freight's economic importance to the region, it is recommended that Metro look for ways to advance the large number of planned but unfunded freight supportive projects that have been identified.*

**Response:** Metro will continue to work with the regional partners to advance needed freight improvements. Over the past several MTIP cycles, Metro has solicited freight improvements, and funded several. However, many freight improvements are eligible for state gas tax revenue and local port and urban renewal funds that are not available for other projects within the MTIP program. Therefore, Metro will seek to ensure that broad programs of funds are allocated to freight improvements at the state and regional level.

OTIA III, in addition to funding a large number of critical bridge preservation projects statewide, also designated \$100 million for freight and economic development related improvements. Metro worked closely with State agencies and the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee to prioritize freight projects for funding under that legislation. As part of this effort, Metro issued a public notice of funding availability and solicited comments on proposed priorities in December 2004. Metro's regional freight committee recommended regional priorities and JPACT and Metro Council also passed a resolution supporting them in early 2005. As a result of these efforts, the region will obtain funding for a number of key freight priorities. The recently

approved MTIP funding allocation included a significant share of freight projects. Metro is also supporting the Governor's Connect Oregon Program (another freight funding proposal) in the 2005 legislative session as well as advocating for a larger road-funding package.

**2004 Review Recommendation 9.** Because ODOT's STIP must reflect Metro's MTIP without modification, it is recommended that Metro work with ODOT to ensure the continued accuracy of MTIP projects in the STIP and that the Metro website take advantage of (and link to) the ODOT STIP web page for current project listings.

**Response:** This recommendation was incorporated into Metro's website and the MTIP database in December 2004.

**2004 Review Corrective Action 9.** *Prior to July 1, 2005, working with ODOT and TriMet, Metro will develop a Title VI Plan that documents how Title VI policies will be applied and any complaints addressed.*

**Response:** Metro has initiated development of a formal Title VI plan with ODOT and TriMet, and expects it to be completed by July 1, 2005. Metro's public involvement processes are Title VI compliant. No major changes to the newly updated Transportation Planning Public Involvement Policy and to existing program public involvement plans will be needed in order to formalize a Title VI plan.

**2004 Review Recommendation 10.** *It is recommended that ODOT and Metro look for ways to better coordinate the development of Environmental Justice (EJ) information (maps of low income and minority populations, etc) used for planning and project purposes.*

**Response:** Metro currently produces and references maps of low income and minority populations to formulate individual public involvement plans. In addition, staff meets with representative organizations of potentially impacted communities to ensure that all residents have access to program and policy development and decision-making opportunities, respectively. When updated census information is not available, Metro has produced similar demographic information through the collection and assimilation of subsidized school lunch data. This program was used in the 2004 MTIP and RTP updates, with findings and recommendations from the analysis included in the decision-making process for both efforts. With the increase in diversity throughout the Portland Metropolitan area, Metro will continue to look for ways to improve upon its demographic data compilation and coordination with ODOT. Publication of a comprehensive Title VI/EJ report is programmed in the UPWP in FY 2005-06.

**2004 Review Recommendation 11.** *If Metro staff is unable to participate in EJ activities for major projects, it is recommended that Metro consider developing an appropriate work item to support these efforts in the next UPWP.*

**Response:** Metro will work with ODOT to define procedures for coordinating Title VI/EJ consideration as part of the report programmed in FY 2005-06.

**2004 Review Corrective Action 10.** *Metro will provide for a public involvement period for air quality conformity determinations no less than that required by the most current Oregon Conformity SIP, as follows: a) currently 30 days, b) the public involvement period will begin no sooner than the day during which all technical and policy information considered in the conformity determination is made available to the public and interagency consultation partners, specifically including USEPA, FTA and FHWA, c) technical information includes results of budget tests and emissions reduction credits taken as well as supporting methodology.*

**Response:** Metro will incorporate these requirements into work programs for any project that requires an air quality conformity analysis, including updates and amendments to the MTIP and RTP.

**2004 Review Corrective Action 11.** *Metro will provide for interagency consultation on MTIP and RTP amendments that require conformity determinations, and will consult when the requirements for conformity are not clear.*

**Response:** This is Metro's current practice, and will continue to be our process for MTIP and RTP updates and amendments.

**2004 Review Recommendation 12.** *It is recommended that Metro strengthen regular interagency consultation processes.*

**Response:** Metro plans to formalize the consultation process for future activities where an air quality conformity finding is needed. Among the improvements to the process will be recorded consultation meetings, reviewing interagency consultation meeting recommendations at TPAC, posting conclusions from consultations in monthly and quarterly reporting and on Metro's website, involvement of Metro legal counsel in the consultation and early involvement and discussion by JPACT and the Metro Council to ensure an understanding of federal expectations. For JPACT and Metro Council discussion, Metro will request that FHWA present their expectations so that decision makers fully understand how the conformity process is embedded in the regional planning process.

**2004 Review Recommendation 13.** *When air quality training opportunities are provided, it is recommended that Metro dedicate resources so that staff can attend.*

**Response:** Metro staff has regularly attended air quality training opportunities and will continue to do so as they become available.

**2004 Review Recommendation 14.** *In the event that future federal RTP and/or MTIP updates are approved by Metro in advance of completing the supporting air quality findings, it is highly recommended that the final RTP and/or MTIP documents carry the effective date of the documents (i.e., the date conformity actions were complete) rather than Metro's initial date of conditional approval.*

**Response:** RTP and MTIP updates are only tentatively approved prior to completing air quality findings, and the published final adoption date occurs when JPACT and Metro Council accept the corresponding air quality analysis. Though Metro does not expect to deviate from this practice, in the future, we will clarify the sequence and significance of Metro and USDOT actions on published materials.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2004-07 )  
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION )  
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO ELIMINATE )  
THE INTERSTATE AVENUE – MLK BOULEVARD )  
ADVANCED TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT )  
SYSTEM (ATMS) PROJECT, CREATE AN 82<sup>ND</sup> )  
AVENUE ATMS PROJECT AND REALLOCATE )  
FUNDS. )

RESOLUTION NO. 05-3553

Introduced by  
Councilor Rex Burkholder

WHEREAS, the Metro Council and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) approved the award of \$550,000 in regional flexible funds for the design and implementation of Advanced Transportation Management System (ATMS) improvements in the Interstate Avenue corridor; and

WHEREAS, ATMS projects provide real-time monitoring of traffic for congestion and incident detection, coordination of traffic signals, notice to emergency responders and rapid clearance of incidents, and real time information to travelers regarding travel conditions to facilitate decisions about time of travel, route choice and mode; and

WHEREAS, implementation of the Interstate Avenue MAX project has since provided the ATMS benefits of signal coordination and fiber communication to the City's central signal operations system; and

WHEREAS, land use changes and street design changes on Interstate Avenue and MLK Jr. Boulevard has limited the utility of traveler information services to guide motor vehicle traffic to Interstate Avenue as an alternative to Interstate-5; and

WHEREAS, the 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue corridor is located parallel to the I-205 interstate freeway but there is currently little coordination between the city of Portland and the Oregon Department of Transportation's ATMS infrastructure of these two facilities; and

WHEREAS, the potential for ATMS benefits of travel time and energy savings and air quality benefits are greater in the 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue corridor; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, the 2004-07 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (adopted December 11, 2003 by Metro Resolution No. 03-3381A FOR THE PURPOSE OF APROVING THE 2004-07 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA) is amended to eliminate the Interstate Avenue – MLK Boulevard ATMS project, add the 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue ATMS project and program funding in the amount of \$550,000 for the federal fiscal year 2005; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the award of these funds is conditioned on the City of Portland providing air quality benefit data upon project implementation for federal reporting purposes.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2005.

---

David Bragdon, Council President

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

---

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney



## **STAFF REPORT**

**IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 05-3553, FOR THE PURPOSE OF  
ELIMINATING THE INTERSTATE AVENUE – MLK BOULEVARD ADVANCED  
TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (ATMS) PROJECT, CREATING AN 82<sup>ND</sup> AVENUE  
ATMS PROJECT AND REALLOCATING FUNDS.**

---

Date: March 24, 2005

Prepared by: Ted Leybold

### **BACKGROUND**

In the 2000 Transportation Priorities process, JPACT and the Metro Council awarded \$550,000 (federal share) to the Interstate Avenue – Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard Advanced Traffic Management System (ATMS) project. With the completion of the Interstate MAX project and changes to street design and land use plans along MLK Jr. Boulevard, conditions in this corridor for the potential benefits of an ATMS project have changed. Portions of the integrated signal coordination system that leads to smooth traffic progression and transit priority treatments were implemented as part of the MAX project. The potential function of Interstate Avenue and MLK Jr. Boulevard as an alternative to Interstate 5 for motor vehicle traffic during congested periods has changed, reducing the utility of the traveler information component of the ATMS project.

The 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and Interstate-205 corridor presents a stronger opportunity to realize the benefits of an ATMS project. An integrated signal coordination system, traveler information program and transit priority treatment system has a great potential for improving air quality and traffic flow. Implementing 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue with ATMS improvements will provide flexible control over operation of the traffic signals in the area. This flexibility will allow better support work proposed by ODOT and TriMet on I-205 and I-205 light rail improvements.

The southern terminus of the project is located just north of the Clackamas County line. ODOT and Clackamas County will plan to connect to this fiber link. The incident plans will reflect the total 82<sup>nd</sup> corridor, not just the piece in Portland.

The project is a part of the Portland Transportation System Plan and the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan and as part of the outreach activities associated with the development of those plans, has met the public outreach requirements of the Transportation Priorities process.

The project improvements are not intended to divert recurring congestion from I-205 to 82<sup>nd</sup>. Instead the ITS devices allow better management of traffic that currently diverts from I-205 during incidents. The ITS devices facilitate diversion of the incident traffic back to the freeway after the traffic bypasses the bottleneck, thereby helping 82<sup>nd</sup> traffic operation.

The 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue project is already in the Regional Transportation Plans financially constrained system and has therefore been conformed for air quality as a part of that plan. As the project does not construct new motor vehicle capacity, and funding of the project through the MTIP is consistent with implementation horizon assumed in the RTP air quality analysis, the project does not require a separate conformity analysis for inclusion in the MTIP.

Furthermore, traffic flow improvements consistent with National ITS architecture are eligible CMAQ activities. As this project meets criteria for consistency, it will be programmed for CMAQ funds, contingent on consultation with federal air quality agencies and an assessment of emissions reduction.

#### **ANALYSIS/INFORMATION**

1. **Known Opposition** None known at this time.
2. **Legal Antecedents** This resolution amends the 2004-07 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) as adopted by Metro Resolution No. 03-3381A (FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPROVING THE 2004-07 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA, adopted December 11, 2003) to eliminate the Interstate Avenue – MLK Boulevard ATMS project, add the 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue corridor ATMS project and program \$550,000 of federal funds to the project in FFY 2005.
3. **Anticipated Effects** Adoption of this resolution is a necessary step to allow the expenditure of regional flexible funds on the 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue corridor ATMS improvements.
4. **Budget Impacts** Adoption of this resolution has no effect on the Metro budget.

#### **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Metro Council approve Resolution No. 05-3553.

**From:** "Jay Mower" <jay.mower@comcast.net>  
**To:** <trans@metro-region.org>  
**Date:** Wed, Mar 30, 2005 10:03 AM  
**Subject:** Thank you, thanks to JPACT

Dear Metro,

I am writing to thank the Metro Council, JPACT, Metro transportation planners, City of Portland staff & elected officials, citizen leaders from SW Portland and others who were involved with the "JPACT and Metro Council Project Priorities" funding package approved March 24, 2005.

I especially want to thank you for funding the \$530,000 pedestrian project "Pd102 SW Capitol Highway (PE): Multnomah to Taylors Ferry". This is an important project.

Over ten years ago I was part of a SWNI-organized walk of the entire length of Capitol Highway with Matt Brown, newly hired by PDOT, along with then City Commissioner Earl Blumenauer, to emphasize the need for pedestrian improvements on this main street in SW. I worked tirelessly for several years on the Hillsdale Town Center Plan, and served on the advisory committee to the Capitol Highway Plan, developed by PDOT. It has been gratifying to see the sidewalks built in Hillsdale and outbound to Multnomah Village. Every time I see pedestrians enjoying these facilities I recall all the work it took to bring them to fruition.

I am very pleased to see this next segment of Capitol Highway, from Multnomah Village outbound to Taylors Ferry Road, receive funding for planning and engineering work. Thank you for advancing this project. It is much needed.

Please convey my thanks to everyone.

Sincerely yours,

Jay Mower

5716 SW Brugger St

Portland, OR 97219

COMMITTEE TITLE JPACT

DATE Thursday, April 14, 2005

NAME	AFFILIATION
Kathryn Schutte	Metro
JIM BERNARD	Milwaukie
Neil McFarlane	TriMet
Mark Turpel	Kato
Jeff Dalin	City Council, Cornelius
Addison Jacobs	Port of Vancouver
Ann Gardner	Schutgershustner
Scott Brickson	Citizen
Rex Wong	WSDOT
Amelia Porterfield	Metro
Nancy Kraushaar	Oregon City
Charlotte Lehan	Wilsonville
Danielle Corwan	Wilsonville
John Hill	Clackamas Co.
Karen Schilling	Multnomah County
Phil Schmitt	TriMet
Richard Brundman	Metro
Lee Leyhold	Metro
Mark Garrity	WSDOT

COMMITTEE TITLE JPACT

DATE Thursday, April 14, 2005

NAME	AFFILIATION
Chuck Becker	Mayor, City of Gresham
Ron Papsdorf	City of Gresham
JOHN CHARLES	Cascade Policy Inst
Rod Park	Me. Ac (Counci)
Sam Adams	city of Portland
Rob Drake	Cities of Washington Co.
Melanie Briggs	Metro
Dave Shields	City of Gresham
MATT GARRETT	ODOT
DICK PEDERSEN	DEQ
Dean Lockingbill	MTC (Att. for City of Vancouver)
Fred Hansen	TriMet
Brian Newman	Metro Council
Lynn Peterson	Lake Oswego Canal
Susie Lausche	Port of Portland
Andy Weyer	Metro
Rex Burkholder	Metro